

THE RAMBLER.

VOL. XI. *New Series.*

JANUARY 1859.

PART LXI.

THE CHRISTMAS OF CHRISTIAN ART.

THE following article is a translation, somewhat abridged, of a lecture delivered to the Arcadian Society of Rome, many years ago, by Professor Minardi. He is still at the head of the Academy of St. Luke, and other artistic institutions of Rome, which, like ourselves, are scarcely more indebted to his unrivalled knowledge of his art and unapproachable practical skill in design than to his extreme amiability in communicating the results of his taste and experience. Our limited space, and the difference of audience, have compelled us reluctantly to omit passages very beautiful, and auxiliary to the tone and effect of this composition, but full of allusions that would have required a running commentary to make them appreciated.

We confess to a degree of diffidence in printing this essay at all in this country; and we only do so because we trust much to the influence of the season that yet revives the feelings of early youth in some, and ought to brighten up the religious sentiment in many others. But we cannot conceal from ourselves that, for the majority of English readers, the leading purpose of the author, to declare art the offspring of humility, will be resented as a declaration of war; for in ninety-nine minds out of a hundred, art is a battle-field where their sole thought is conquest. The first impulse of an Englishman on seeing a picture is, not to receive pleasure, but to resist successfully its mute appeal for praise. Hence we run after all manner of critical books that furnish us with ready excuses for not admiring; and the barbarous incongruities of Pugin, and the ridiculous ruffianism of Ruskin, are enough to destroy art for a whole generation, and make clergy and laity, rich and poor, content to undervalue real

works of art, to harness themselves to a Juggernaut of traffic, and point to gaudy gilding and patches of expensive pigments as evidences of their taste for paint. We, indeed, live in the days of coloured dolls and gilt gingerbread; but we know these can neither excite nor satisfy any one's devotion. They are not an art, but a trade; and minister not to the piety, but to the vanity, of men. They are not real expressions of a feeling that seeks a language, but a selection of conventional phrases made to order like any other matter of business. Excessively intolerant of expedients in art, these convention-men deal in shams. Yet the shaft of a column daubed chocolate is not a bit less sham porphyry than if it had the white spots on it; nor does the marbling on plaster make it less orthodox than if it were coloured of a uniform hue like stone. Painted ciphers are mere tricks; and coloured inscriptions belong to calligraphy, not painting (except sign-painting). No number of gilders turned into a church can make there a work of Christian art; and the skill to construct a picture or a building that shall be mistaken for one of the twelfth, thirteenth, or any other century, belongs to the art of forgery, not to those of painting and architecture. There are many men extant who believe that religious art is revived, or reviving, in this country. In our judgment its dry bones are as dry as ever. Never a sign of life can we discover. Where are the original works of religious art by native artists during all these years that we have been clamouring round the grave of the dear departed? How many works of good foreign masters have been imported into our chapels? No, commerce and quackery have set their seals upon the tomb, and the pretended revivers are but resurrection-men that have an eye to the dead body. Yet, though true art is not now, and probably never, in the pride and corruptions of civilisation, can be again the fashion, there are many quiet and pious minds who will derive consolation and strength in reading the following pages; and though they may never be numerous enough nor stirring enough to turn the stream of public patronage into the course of real religious art, it must always be of some value to the cause of truth to record such testimony as that we now lay before our readers.

Paganism, the product of human pride and passion, could not last for ever; for pride and passion are incompatible with humility, the root of virtues, without which nothing can be durable, no society can be at rest, or free from internal corruption and from intestine discord. So paganism fell when Humility, from her throne in the East, surrounded by the

modest virtues of Christianity, gave the signal of its doom. But pride and passion died not; they survived to wage constant war with Christianity, and sometimes apparently to triumph anew.

With paganism, pagan art died too. But in time art rose again, transfigured and inspired with a Christian spirit, informed with modesty and simplicity, completely renewed with the new religion, and thenceforth as truly Christian art as it had before been pagan. As the handmaid of religion, it reared temples of sublime significance,—places of mystery which filled men with indefinable awe. Here were to be seen in painting and sculpture the triumphs of Divine Humility, working miracles without ostentation, succouring the oppressed, consoling the afflicted, enlightening the blind, enfranchising the slave, and humiliating the proud,—not to crush them, but to change them into her children, and by humbling them to clothe them in her own glorious robes of simplicity and modesty. As pride had covered the earth like a deluge, so now in these temples art spoke of nothing but humility.

And when this new power first came to regenerate our race and repair our ruin, it first sought out the humblest and most obscure of men, and announced its advent to a few poor simple shepherds. So it became the great object of Christian art to represent worthily this first act of the Redeemer's humility; and so happily was it accomplished, so pure is the picture which has been stereotyped for our contemplation, that the method may well appear the only one worthy the name of sacred art. Yet afterwards the spirit of pride contrived to intrude its specious forms and meretricious beauties even into the representation of the Christmas mystery, thus sullyng its purity and obscuring its significance; as if humility could be clothed and decked out with ornaments of vanity and robes of pride, and purity could adopt the ensigns of indecency.

Before entering on the consideration of Christian art and the Nativity, we will glance at the state and the spirit of art previous to Christianity. There never was a people with so exquisite a natural judgment and sentiment of the beautiful as the Greeks. Nor were there ever artists more gifted with genius or more favoured by circumstances in their attempts to express the beautiful, to seize and to crystallise the idea into concrete forms. All men are more or less anxious to express outwardly their more vivid internal feelings, especially on the three absorbing subjects of religion, love, and war. But the Greek artists, fed and formed upon mythological ideas already raised to marvellous sublimity by the

genius of their poets, and upon religious pomps that appealed powerfully to the senses, had gradually, by their practice of perfectly imitating natural objects, acquired the power of conceiving certain archetypal ideas of their gods, which all sensible men own to be perfect in ideal beauty, and to be faultless expressions of their idea of superhuman beings. But we need not say what were the ethical qualities of these beings. Certainly the virtues which are necessary to constitute the morality, and therefore the happiness of mankind, were not their essential characteristics; on the contrary, the most vicious might take them for his example and authority. They have nothing to do with the true God and Father of all beings.

Doubtless in these archetypal forms there were certain divine qualities,—the majesty of imperial might, a superhuman grandeur and dignity, an enchanting loveliness that embraced all pleasure. But these are qualities which can exalt and possess the imagination, but can never satisfy the heart with true, pure, and lasting happiness. Indeed, as the pleasures of the imagination must be all sensible, a religion which satisfies them must be one that will drag the heart into the sink of carnal vices, till, in the natural progress from depth to depth, it plunges into the lowest infamies of unbridled passion, and destroys or defiles every germ of virtue. In such a religion the debauchery and drunkenness of the orgies, and the nameless abominations of the mysteries, naturally became the most acceptable homage that could be offered to the deities, and the favourite practices of popular devotion. And these practices gave birth to new archetypes of inferior deities altogether sensual, but well expressing what was intended, and admirable as works of art,—satyrs, fauns, and hundreds of others, down to hermaphrodites, and lower still, till the human form was quite bestialised. And the artists, daily more fully inspired with these archetypal ideas, kept inventing the most expressive representations of them, full of fancy, caprice, and ingenuity; and finished with that Greek art which is but another name for the impress of nature, and for a universal beauty that appeals equally to all nationalities, ages, and characters. But in spirit it is the expression of the Greek religion, and of the morals which it engendered; and therefore as different from Christian art as our God from the pagan deities, and His religion from theirs.

Christian painting was in its origin simple, modest, and saintly. Writers of all ages, and of the most opposite tastes, however poor and crude they may think our primitive art, concur in declaring that the saints and heroes of Christianity

must be painted after its models in figure, costume, and expression;* and, what is more, even professors of the art, though educated amid the monstrosities of the eighteenth century, or fallen still lower, have declared that the saints of our old artists are real saints, and that real saints cannot be painted in any other way. It is certain that the types established in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were always followed by Leonardo, Fra Bartolomeo, Andrea del Sarto, and Rafaele, the princes of art, and more or less by all the rest of that golden age, and in some measure too in the schools of the succeeding centuries, though in a crazy incoherent manner; for true taste always preserves some thread of continuation in the progress of feeling and sentiment, however confused or hidden in the mists of error.

A God is born to us, a Son is given to us! To confound the pride whence springs all the evil of the world He comes to redeem, He manifests Himself as a tender infant, in the lowest possible humiliation. How shall painting represent this mystery to our eyes? It shall not even lay Him in a manger, on a wisp of straw, according to the sacred text, but on the bare ground; for the least addition would be an offence to His humility, a subtraction from its completeness. If a piece of rag is wrapped about Him,—which is not always the case,—it is simply a sign of that mother's love which could not omit so simple a service. But for the rest, she respects the voluntary abjection of her Son, seeming neither to torment herself about it, nor to be busied in efforts to alleviate it; and simply places herself on one side in the most profound and unaffected contemplation. She kneels modestly on the bare ground, her hands joined, her eyes fixed on her Son, perfectly unconscious of every thing else, because in comparison with Him all else is nothing. Her garments are arranged over her person so as to give a good idea of the internal peace and pure simplicity of her soul. On the other side the just St. Joseph is painted in similar attitude; not thrown in any how, but symmetrically. Where there is virtue there must be order; things thrown about hap-hazard show want of order, and art can only indicate order by means of symmetry. So in painting the mystery of the renewal of order, every thing should be symmetrical and arranged like a religious ceremony.

Angels descend from heaven, and humble shepherds join Mary and Joseph in adoring their Creator and God. But

* It has been reserved to our own time and country to ignore one of the most inviolate traditions of Christian art, which we affect to restore, by representing before "the wild tribes of London" the Holy Family under the guise of a horde of Bedouin Arabs.

the angels do not rush or tumble down, or sprawl like spread-eagles; nor do the shepherds hurry and race to the cabin where their Desire lies. All violent movement or crowding is contrary to quiet and simplicity. Here the subject is the depth of humility, which is ever quiet, simple, tranquil, collected; never expending her energies in gestures and attitudes, nor raising her voice, nor showing the least symptom of emotion. And in such a picture every thing should conspire to express the simplest humility.

But how can a painter, bound to this reserve, give the requisite dignity to the scene? This does not depend on the painter; it belongs to the Spirit of the Gospel gradually to form in men's minds and hearts the type realised by Christian art, from which no artist dared to depart as long as the Spirit of the Gospel guided and inspired our schools.

The angels in the picture are simple, quiet, and symmetrically disposed, like Mary and Joseph, as if for an ecclesiastical function; and, like them, kneeling with joined hands in meditation and prayer, evincing the same feelings; and thus most artistically conducing to the unity and simplicity of the whole: light and delicate in dress, as befits celestial spirits; with nothing fantastic in form or heavy in motion, for aerial spirits must not seem to be inert; in motion every where equable, orderly, and symmetrical; dressed with the greatest simplicity, with nothing superfluous, nothing to embarrass the person, which should appear beneath lithe and delicate, but modest. Thus does art clothe the simplest idea with the simplest variety, in subordination to truth; and this variety, springing spontaneously and naturally from the most interesting moment of the event represented, and not produced by tricks of art, best satisfies the requirements of the rules of art, and most completely delights the eye. This variety, by its spontaneity and simplicity, brings out the simplicity of the idea; and humility, the principal object, becomes also the prevailing characteristic.

The poor shepherds come to behold the face of their God! Though called, they dare not present themselves. Yet you see in them no fear or agitation; for the face of humility does not frighten, nor does the heart of the humble tremble: but they stand stiffly behind; one leaning on his staff, his soul already absorbed, and his limbs therefore showing scarcely a sign of life; another brings a lamb on his shoulders to offer to the True Lamb, but his shepherd's humility shrinks from presenting it, so he too stands motionless; a third, motionless also, the simplest of all in his humility, joins his hands, and does what he sees Mary and Joseph

doing. They are poorly clad, with short and scanty tunics, ordinary in person, in countenance fair and modest; for we could not accept strong muscular limbs, bronzed faces, and shaggy beards, as the exponents of innocent tranquil humility. There are but few angels or shepherds, for a mob spoils simplicity, and conceals humility; and the scanty number indicates that the really humble are but few.

But there was great joy; all nature kept holiday, and hosts of angels appeared in heaven. How did our artists preserve the idea of humility in such a scene? The heart that overflows with strong feeling, will not want means to express it. If there is holiday in heaven, there, at the top of the picture, is a circlet of angels standing out against the serene sky on a white cloud, not voluminous or dense, but rare and tranquil; or else there is a mystical triad of angels standing and singing *Gloria in excelsis*. There is a holiday on earth; and in the background you may see the other shepherds remaining with their flocks, and tuning on their pipes hymns of joy, which rise to heaven in harmony with the angels' melodies. The flocks show their gladness; and kids and lambs keep holiday after their fashion. The landscape is green, white flowerets are blooming, the trees are sprouting; the sky is clear, melting away into a dawn of unusual softness.

Now why do all the Christian painters represent the great event in full daylight, though every old woman knows it happened by night? Because pictorial art has its own postulates, which must be obeyed to make it effective to the eye, much more to the heart or mind; and a picture that has no effect on mind or heart, and is not even seductive to the eye, is meaningless.

Suppose we had to represent Christmas-night, Christ bringing light into the world, but—and this is the characteristic of the mystery—in the humblest guise. How make this intelligible, if your picture is a mass of darkness? We understand through the senses; and sensations repugnant to the intended meaning destroy the intended effect. But suppose we lighten up the night with the rays which proceed from the Infant? A good idea; but after producing your brightest blaze of light, you will find that the brilliant dazzling gleam is inconsistent with the ideas of humility, quiet, tranquillity, and simplicity. It requires no metaphysics, but only common sense, to see this. Hence a picture thus designed could never suggest a just idea of the humility we wish to represent. And reasons of art concur with the feelings in proving the impossibility. For the picture would be a problem, requiring many tricks of art,—contrasts, obscuration of parts,

and economies that demand great sacrifices. For the painter, not having real light on his palette, is obliged to give a vivid appearance to the low degree of light which he can command, not only by contrasting great masses of the strongest shadow, but also by darkening and almost destroying all near objects, or at most animating them with some few gleams of secondary light. And for this artists are obliged to employ a kind of legerdemain, which noways consorts with the simplicity requisite for the purest and simplest of subjects. Moreover, pictures which depend on delicacy of expression require exquisite form, subtlety of design investing the minutest details with life and grace, soft plays of light, and magical sweetness of tints, to concur in producing the intended effect. But how can they be introduced in night-pieces? We must give up all these accessories,—the soft morning sky, the green fields gemmed with flowers, the shepherds with their flocks,—which so powerfully contribute to move various affections, and together form an enchanting unity, a sweet harmonious symphony.

Our painters showed exquisite skill in finding room for all these accessories. They reduced the stable of Bethlehem to a bare frame, half-thatched, shelterless against storm and cold. This conventional way of painting the stable at the same time enhanced, in the simplest and most natural way, the miserable condition of the patient Infant, which was the painter's chief scope; whereas if the night-effect had been tried, every thing would have appeared entirely artificial, however consummate the skill with which it was managed. But it was impossible to try it. The brilliancy of a torch by night depends on the thickness of the surrounding darkness; by daylight a torch, or any other artificial light, is paled and quenched by the illuminated objects around.

But Christian art adds a remarkable party to this type of the grotto of Bethlehem. The Lord of the lowly is also the King of kings, whom He also calls to Himself. Hence the three Magi are often found in the picture, with their train of camels and horses. They come to offer their homage; but, like the rest, they stand off, humbly waiting for a signal to approach; or else they stand with the shepherds before Him, in whose sight rank vanishes, and whose children are all equal. Both kings and shepherds offer their gifts without crowding or tumult; all is simple, quiet, and orderly; every thing breathes sanctity and innocence; and no soul that is not imbued with foolish notions can help feeling an inexplicable sweetness while contemplating the picture.

Certainly you find not the majesty, the grandeur, the

proud imperial strength of Olympian Jove; nor the haughty beauty of Apollo; nor the soft graces of the foam-born goddess, who makes men's hearts foam with passion. If your eye and taste are merely Greek, you will only see and feel puerility, crudeness, and poverty in Christian art; but may not the poverty, crudeness, and puerility be in your own eye, easily dazzled and blinded as it is by every kind of splendour, —by a volcanic eruption, a flash of lightning, or a bouquet of rockets, which will make the most beautiful gem, the purest diamond, the brightest star of the heavens, appear but dull and languid sparklets, and make you laugh at yourself for having once admired their soft radiance? So, when a crowd of earthly objects preoccupies our sense, the heart and intellect become too heavy and stupid for delicate and pure emotions; but in the humble path of virtuous thought, what much more beautiful things do the stars whisper to the heart, or the glowworm's silent lamp, or a single ray of the pale moon, than volcano, lightning, or rocket! According as the spirit that informs us is gentle or malign, do we see joy or gloom in all that surrounds us. If we are blinded, we see nothing but darkness; and this is the desperate condition of the proud. But to the eye of Christian humility even night loses its obscurity, and sometimes speaks to the heart more consolingly than day itself. It unveils the glory of the firmament, ravishes the soul to the throne of its Creator, and makes the heart beat with its beauty. It was not so to the pagan. The cold Diana, so chaste by day, could tell a different story of the night. This was always the case with the heathen; what heart, then, could he have for the sweetness of a picture of humility and modesty? He cannot understand it; perhaps he will mock at it.

The excellence of Greek art consists in its invariable fidelity to nature. Not that the true need always be beautiful; but the untrue is never beautiful. The beautiful is a reality, and no chimera. We do not pretend to define it; its texture is too complicated, its sources too various, to be simplified to a formula, or packed and dried in a definition. But Greek art, whose beauty is too conspicuous to need defining, has this fundamental characteristic, that it brings out and stereotypes in the individual the essential form of the species. And so well could it discover the geometric outline of this form, and draw it so correctly without attending to the thousand accidental peculiarities that distinguish individuals and sometimes almost hide their specific characters, that Greek art becomes almost a palpable revelation of these forms; while its modes of operation are so natural, that it may be as well character-

ised by the extreme simplicity of its processes. And since in nature each species differs notably from every other *ad infinitum*, Greek art had an inexhaustible source of that ever-varied yet simple propriety which is so marvellously effective. This material and geometrical form undergoes many modifications when the individual is agitated by passion; and these changes produce new forms, which, being identified with the original forms, are also the subjects of Greek art. If the arts of other nations can boast of various beauties, it is only in so far as they obey this essential law: arts that disregard it are all foolish, though produced by high genius, though adorned with new and splendid forms. And however fashionable they may be for a time, they will vanish like all other extravagances.

Christian art, as revived in Italy, possesses all those essential qualities of Greek art which are the principles of true beauty. Any art which neglects these principles in representing natural things is shocking. Hence art, whether pagan or Christian, is so far one and the same, and cannot change without becoming unnatural. A most vital truth, the right comprehension of which might perhaps have formerly prevented the arts from degenerating in their mechanism, however they might have erred in their scope, and might now prevent scholars and artists from crying up Christian art as a thing different in kind from anterior art; for the principle of all art is always one and unchangeable, like the principle of beauty. To the eye beauty is variable *ad infinitum*, as is the scope of art, from which it takes its inspiration and its tone; but the principles of artistic handling are invariable. Thus, however laudable the intention of the purists of Christian art, they do no service, and even do mischief, by making themselves ridiculous. And if artists in general, who for the most part are like persons who sing by ear, had somewhat understood this truth, we should not have had that Babel of stupid quarrels between classicists and romanticists, purists and antipurists, and meagre and muscular schools, which disgraces the heads and hearts of artists.

It is certain, that unless art is vivified by a grand object it is feeble and insipid, and becomes a mere plaything. But there can be no sublimer object than religion, which includes every virtuous aim, feeds and educates all our affections, and raises them to enthusiasm. How mighty was the false pretence of religion in antique art! What, then, should be the power of the true heaven-descended religion, whose vivid and holy beams attracted the greatest minds of paganism, and forced its adversaries to confess that it alone was the religion

of the heart, man's only happiness even on earth ! The change that it worked in the arts is a sign of its power over the heart.

After Christianity had won the best part of mankind, and religious enthusiasm had succeeded to the spirit of pride, which was scotched, not killed ; when a pure worship had supplanted the sensual pagan rites, and the Cross had taken possession of their purified altars,—the Cross became the cynosure of all eyes, all drank of the consolation that flowed from it, and all thirsted to visit as pilgrims the Holy Land which it had consecrated. It filled men's mouths, it was signed on their breasts, it confirmed their bonds, it ensured their oaths, and placed the crusader's sword in their hands for its vindication. And the enthusiasm of those red-cross warriors raised the arts from the ruins of paganism, with which they had fallen because they had been its ministers in deranging and bewitching the world. Prostrate in devout and enthusiastic melancholy before the Holy Sepulchre, psalms and gospels chanting in their ears, the arts were inundated with joy, and dreamed of new sublimities. Under this inspiration they raised there a temple of novel and mysterious aspect, where they were educated in silence by the voice of the Evangelists, till they issued forth candid and simple, and bright with evangelical love. Though shorn of their ancient splendour, their serene tranquillity radiated peace, love, and virtue, and turned men's hearts to their Redeemer. Nevertheless they did not spurn the charms of earthly enrichments, which they turned to the glory of God, gratefully clothing themselves in His gifts ; but with such reserve and order, that their moderation and simplicity were not spoiled but ennobled, and their purity shone more purely through their rich robes ; which they could forego when it was proper for the illustration of Christian humility—their sole aim, their sole inspiration, which rendered them daily more graceful and heavenly. So they used the treasures of past and present, and converted them all into aliment for their beauty.

Then came the age of Dante, when Florence and the whole soil of Italy bloomed with fresh flowers of art, which promised the most glorious future. But pride burst forth anew and nipped the bud. Though reason whispers to the heart that humility is the root of virtue, the heart is kept from acquiescing by the touchiness of pride, whose hunger, aggravated by food, only breeds fresh desires. In this state, the mind, which is always unstrung when out of harmony with the heart, was accidentally caught by the remains of pagan art, enchanted with its real grandeur and beauty, and inspired with the vain hope of enriching and strengthening Christian art with its spirit. So pride soon dressed her up, and made her

think that she was strong enough to go alone; that forcibleness and strength were the root of right and virtue; and that humility was ridiculous: forgetting that strength alone makes men wolves and tigers; as, indeed, the men of that day were, when Machiavelli wrote the code of the policy of brute force, and when fire and sword overran Italy with a corruption that contaminated the sources of wisdom.

Still the arts were growing in beauty and in heavenly purity; and the fiery column of Christianity still lightened the ways, converted many a wanderer, and found many champions to clear the encumbered roads and to repair the ruins; and the struggle between the fortitude of virtue and the ferocity of vice was never more determined. But art is defenceless in such a conflict. Though she had her champions, yet, on the other hand, pride was insidiously inoculating her with paganism. Fortune was against her: Leonardo abandoned the helm; Fra Bartolomeo and others retired into their convents; others fell and were carried away in the stream; and Raffaele, who seemed called to preserve her and raise her to new life, was removed from an unworthy world that had sought to deprave even him, leaving only one mighty, but fierce and proud genius, as if for the punishment of an age of pride.

But to return to our "Nativity." It is observable that the type of this picture was perfected in Umbria, where St. Francis had shown himself a living image of Christ, an apostle of humility, the spouse of poverty. And in Umbria Christian art was purest; so true is it that art and morals go together, and that the spirit of art depends on the moral spirit of the country and age. Let us see how this beautiful type was spoiled by the spirit of pride.

Man has an innate longing for his Creator, which makes him naturally religious. Though passion made him err, and defiled him with paganism, yet the religious sentiment was never extinguished, but produced the marvellous results which we yet admire. And it gained a still greater victory; for though the restless and voluble imagination of man whirled many generations irresistibly through ages of confusion, yet in spite of this the inborn religious principle was able for so many centuries to preserve unchanged the artistic types. The restless Greek, proud of his versatile science and refined civilisation, always lusting for novelty, attempted to innovate on the traditional types of his gods; but Plato protested in the name of religion and philosophy against such a revolution, and pride obeyed and turned elsewhere for change. Again, in the height of Roman power, a dictator who wished to build his house like a temple was forbidden to do so; and so strong

was the religious sentiment at Rome, that though every innovation that luxury could suggest was tolerated in all other matters, in religion they kept to their old forms, and respected the primitive ideas. It was strictly forbidden to confound sacred and profane art. This is, then, an instinctive law; and accounts for the mystical interest we take in sacred things, and the reverence with which we contemplate their remains.

This feeling was transfused into Christianity so conspicuously, that even the rough, artless, deformed paintings of the catacombs, and of the sanctuaries of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, are so full of meaning that they pierce the heart. May their poor remains be respected! This explains the profound mystery which Christian art infused into the minutest details of the *Presepio*, and which constitutes its value. The same is in its measure true of all other religious subjects, which spoke profoundly with their symbolic characters as long as art was inspired with the Christian spirit. But the crystal was but too easily dimmed with the breath of impurity; and we are unable to see its beauty, because of an inveterate corruption, which makes it seem like the incomprehensible literature of an unknown tongue.

He who errs from the path, may easily fall down a precipice. It is certain that after the death of Raffaele Christian art disappeared from the world, and unbridled pride had free course to fill art with vanity, intemperance, and foolish license; and after breaking with every tradition, it went on to destroy those essential laws which are the foundation of artistic mechanism. From that time art was a sham. If the titanic Michael Angelo was not the cause of this fatal movement, at least he gave its greatest impulse. Suddenly the arts, not of Italy only, but of Europe, degenerated under his fatal influence: the proofs stare us in the face. Pride soon disdained our humble *Presepio*, as the invention of artists without genius; our simplicity of idea it nicknamed crudity; it was impatient of the economy and symmetry that made our compositions simple, modest, and balanced; novelty was what it wanted. It reversed our order, made every thing busy, crowded the canvas; and where all human passions had been at rest, there was confusion and tumult instead. Order became disorder, economy profusion, simplicity and modesty license and vanity. Paganism was outdone; Madonnas became Junos; St. Joseph a bewhiskered Pluto; the humble shepherds gladiators and prize-fighters. This was the goal of "*Di Michelangiol la terribil via.*" The unction, the sanctity, the religious sense of the Christian mystery were gone. And at last the principles of manipulation that had hitherto guided our

artists' hands went too. For art, at first penetrated with a simple idea, which it carried out in all parts, necessarily invested every detail with qualities analogous to those of the whole. But now the unbridled license introduced contrary effects even into execution ; and art degenerated not only in its scope, but in itself. Nor did the loss of Christian inspiration affect only the followers of Michael Angelo. Think for a moment of Correggio's famous *Presepio* at Dresden, marvellous for the art in which the light radiating from the infant bathes the picture, and startles the beholder. But the light is more earthly than heavenly, and people spontaneously named the picture *La Notte del Correggio*, and not his *Presepio*; for in spite of its artistic merit, it wants that pure expression and that mystical character which make a picture religious.

Thus pride, under pretext of reform, chased Christian art from the world, divided it from its Christian centre, changed its ancient scope, and destroyed all that was left of it. Whatever art remained was driven from the sanctuary, and used for idle or vile ends. Yet Christianity survived, and spoke powerfully to many a heart. In the Bolognese school, where the Caracci combated the Michaelangelism of Florence, there were men capable of the ancient purity. But the pagan spirit had got hold of all the arts; and all attempts to reconcile it with the Christian spirit only produced fresh licenses, and made artists still more revolvers from the traditional types. The unsuccessful attempts to reproduce them only served to prove that good feeling was not extinct; or that it was sometimes able, in spite of obstacles, to make a picture that had some taste of religion, and was capable of touching the devotion of the people.

And then, as the real ruling principle of art had been attacked and had become insufficient, the revived pagan art was felt to be unsatisfactory. Foremost among the malcontents was the proud and disdainful Caravaggio, who maintained that painting had nothing to do with rules or principles or inspiration, but only with imitating nature any how. He had a ready hand and correct eye, practised in flowers, fruit, and pothouse still-life. The popular applause thus obtained made him conceited enough to try his hand at saints and madonnas; and really his strength and boldness fill his canvases and attract the eye. Hence he was run after by a troop of painters with feathers in their caps, swords by their sides, and guitars hanging from their shoulders; bewhiskered, be-curved, and flashily dressed, content with easy nature, and called *naturalists*. And the result was, that material nature only gave them gross material forms, which degraded all no-

bility of spiritual feeling; and so, more than once, Caravaggio's paintings, valuable as they were, had to be removed from the altar, so offensive were they to common sense, which perceives the dignity of sacred things, and resents their profanation. But this school, under pretence of fidelity to nature, went on to degrade art by their grossness and triviality, without a thought of sacred tradition or religious decorum. It was the victory of indocile pride, ready to blurt out its last poison. Every thing concurred. It fixed its centre at Paris, where the Revolution made a jest of virtue and religion, legalised rebellion, instituted festivals and spectacles in derision of Christianity, cancelled the memory of antiquity, set children against their parents, and threatened to engulf the earth. Painting suffered as we might naturally expect. The spirit of *Christus Consolator* had lent it a celestial beauty; the infernal spirit made it black, gloomy, and full of vanity. The sanguinary David was chosen as its congenial champion; a man who could not see a batch of victims passing to the guillotine without making a brutal joke—"They are going to grind a lot of red to-day." This is the man who discovered that Christianity is not adapted for art, and who published this grand dogma with the pomp and authority of a philosopher of the new sect that had enlightened the whole world. He forgot Leonardo and Rafaele, and the scriptural inspirations of the terrible Michael Angelo, who surpassed himself in those sublime Prophets and Sibyls of the Sistine Chapel, and in that Creator of sun and stars, who is forming man by pointing with his finger; figures which certainly equal the Phidian Jove, however different in character and spirit. And yet these despisers of Christian art robbed Italy of all her treasures to deck Paris; like the beast which, after tearing a poor girl to pieces, walked off with her embroidered veil sticking to his claws. And David, waxing bolder as his following increased, went on denouncing death to all but pagan art, like a brigand in a melodrama; and drew to his side a band of foolish admirers. But it was a silly scene out of a bloody comedy, and he was but a silly histrionic painter. And his stage has fallen with him so low, that people now despise and laugh at it. And yet this foolish profaning of a divine art was declared to be the restoration and progress of civilisation and philosophy; and further, it was accepted as such in the country of Leonardo and of Rafaele, where art, banished from Greece, had found an asylum and a home. And, to the shame of Italy be it said, the infection still remains. Italy, the teacher of the nations, stretched forth her hands with abject mendicity to receive her payment in the

false jewels offered by those who mocked at her, dressed herself up in the meretricious trumpery she had brought herself to admire, and taught herself to mince the sham compliments and infantine prattle of a foreign gibberish, almost forgetting the deep harmonies of her own tongue. She lost her nationality, and crept after France in servile and apish imitation. And what became of her art? Till then her art at least was Italian, was honoured as Italian by other nations, and might have been gradually restored from its degradation. But since, what do foreigners say? They say that she may boast of the past, not of the present. That Italy's glory is in the dead, not in the living. And those who are loudest in saying so, are they who bragged of being the regenerators of Italy!

And what has the French Revolution or French Empire given to the world? It destroyed every thing around it, and rebuilt nothing as good. And now the nations are reduced to forming museums of the fragments that are left; they are contented even to find fragments of the Ro-co-co so justly despised, but which is yet an evidence of the former fertility and lordly abundance of Italian genius. Such is the poverty, so senseless are the products, of the French revolutionary school, that France herself laughs at them. What a touchstone of the value of her regenerative measures!

Is it possible to restore Christian art? let us ask our own hearts. We destroyed it; we can call it back. It is founded on love, and it hates revenge; it will not come except where it finds pure love. We see many who are ravished with its beauty; many who deplore its fatal fall, and pray for its restoration. France herself despises the apish imitators of the French apostate. But people seem rather wearied of the world than truly enamoured of pure love. The tones of pride and of egotism are still heard in the cries of equality and fraternity. The end of man is now to use material forces,—he cares for nothing else; he has already reduced the most stubborn elements, and seems likely to make all yield to his gigantic machinery. But when all is done, will he be happier or more contented? No; his heart cannot be satisfied with earth. He has in him a heavenly spark, which, in spite of the world, makes him feel that he has higher destinies and a higher sphere of action than working like a beast of burden on the earth, even than discovering new lands, tunnelling mountains, shutting out the sea, making the lightnings and light itself his servants, however loudly these wonderful works declare his divine origin. And as they have in themselves no human end, we may be sure that they are intended

to gather materials for the Christian arts, which will one day rise fairer than ever, and raise a new Solomon's Temple to the God of Humility—the Creator and Redeemer of mankind.

Art, poetry, and literature are sure tests of the state and spirit of a population, as flowers and fruit characterise the tree. What are we to say of Italy judged by this test? Let us say that she has just escaped from a wreck, and has not had time to recall her scattered senses. She is rather a subject for pity than for criticism. It is not the first shipwreck she has had to suffer. Formerly, whatever rock she struck on, her only anchor, her only helm, her only harbour of refuge was religion. Within this harbour, her poetry, her literature, her arts may grow again fairer than ever. Outside it, neither arts, nor letters, nor life will ever be aught but silly, contemptible, and miserable.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON EDUCATION.

WHAT henceforward is to be the attitude of English Catholics towards the Crown and Parliament of Britain? In the progress of civilisation and the advance of popular liberty, shall we, by showing honour and respect to the civil magistrate within his legitimate sphere, prove ourselves fit inhabitants of a land of freedom? or shall we, by adopting the principles of those “whose infirm and baby minds are gratified by mischief,” strengthen the worst prejudices of our religious and political opponents?

Questions so momentous arise upon consideration of the course which Catholics propose to take in reference to the Royal Commission on Education. At so late a period, when prejudice and passion have been already roused, calm discussion would appear almost hopeless; and we should not undertake so forlorn a task as the discussion involves, were we not persuaded of the pure intentions of our co-religionists, who may sometimes suffer themselves to be deceived, but assuredly never persevere in an exposed error. There is reason to believe that upon the subject of the Royal Commission they have been very much misinformed.

And yet the history of the Commission is extremely simple. Lord John Russell, Sir John Pakington, and the secularists, one after another, had failed in their attempts to

induce parliament to pass bills for the promotion of elementary education. Checked, but not discouraged, Sir J. Pakington saw that before he could hope to obtain the concurrence of the House, he must from a careful investigation of the facts secure a basis of generally received data. Accordingly, during the session of 1858 he moved an address to the Queen, praying her majesty to issue a Royal Commission, to inquire and report how the large sums voted by parliament had been disposed of, and what means, if any, could be taken to render popular education more general, cheaper, and better. The address was carried shortly before the change of ministry. It was no secret. The debate was duly reported in the newspapers, and perused by Catholics as well as others. Once and again questions as to the issue of the Commission were subsequently put in the House of Commons, and ministers as often replied that they were carefully selecting names, and hoped speedily to complete the list. All this was notorious to every newspaper-reader; and if the leaders who represent the interests of Catholic education allowed such warnings to pass unheeded, and, as seems to have been the case, made no claim for the appointment of a Catholic commissioner until the Commission had been already gazetted, the fault was theirs, and the blame attaches to them alone. It cannot, indeed, be pretended that the Catholic body holds many men qualified to serve the country in so difficult and delicate a matter. Yet some such we have. One occurs to the mind involuntarily. He has gained his experience, not on platforms and in committee-rooms, from speeches and debates, but in the homes and schools of our poor children. He is not notorious for the maintenance of high-wrought theories, which would only obstruct the candid consideration of a national subject, but for lavishing his means and his health upon the education and the social and religious improvement of the lower classes. Father Hutchison of the London Oratory would certainly have been solicited to serve upon the Commission, had not his religion and his humility concealed his special qualifications from men in power.

However, the Commission was gazetted. The Duke of Newcastle is at its head, with six other commissioners, all Protestant. All of them are men of ability, known for liberality of sentiment, and free from suspicion of unfairness towards any section of the community. Still, they are all Protestant. The Commissioners, who are unpaid, cannot themselves conduct the local investigations which their task involves; but having got at the facts, they will embody them

in a report to the Queen, and deduce from them some principles which may be adopted as the basis of future legislation. For the purpose of collecting information, they have appointed ten Assistant Commissioners; and deeming it unnecessary and impossible to exhaust the inquiry for the whole of England, they have selected ten specimen districts,—two metropolitan, two manufacturing, two agricultural, two mining, and two maritime. The instructions given to the Assistant Commissioners have been published in a blue-book, and may readily be consulted. The Assistants are first of all charged to “dismiss from their minds any conclusions they may have derived from the public discussion of late years; because the value of their investigations would be entirely destroyed if they were influenced by any controversial bias, ecclesiastical, political, or economical.” They are then instructed in a spirit of the utmost fairness to inquire into “(1) the statistics, and (2) the condition, methods, and results of all public, private, evening, and Sunday schools of various religious denominations, whether Church or Dissenting, inspected or uninspected,” within their respective districts. The Assistant Commissioners who have yet been named are Protestants. They are not to inquire into the moral results of education, which the Commissioners will endeavour to learn through other channels. In regard to religion, they are directed to ascertain, but simply as a matter of fact, what formularies are taught, and if they are so taught as to be understood. The intellectual results are to be gathered from the employers of labour, clergymen, governors of gaols, inspectors of police, shopkeepers, and every available quarter. They are also to visit schools, and pursue inquiries about books, subjects taught, teachers, and methods.

It will be at once observed, that the contemplated inquiry is so vast that it can scarcely be completed in the present generation. Much of the ground, however, has been already gone over; much is inaccessible; and dread of parliament will probably drive the Commissioners through the rest at a rapid pace. That is not the question for us. Sooner or later the inquiry will be closed, and the report presented. Meantime, while it is in progress, how should Catholics deal with it? The Commissioners have no power to force information, or to thrust themselves into any school against the wish of the owners or managers. Any Catholic may shut them out, and refuse to answer their questions. All of us are free to do so. Is this the wise and right way to treat them?

In discussing a question which so nearly touches the religious interests of the bulk of the Catholic laity, and, indeed,

affects the salvation of thousands of souls of the poor, we speak, of course, with due submission to ecclesiastical authority, desiring nothing but to promote the welfare and progress of the Church: and we revoke and wish unsaid any word which may seem to tend in an opposite direction. The Catholic public have been appealed to on one side. False issues have been raised. In stating actual facts, we desire to furnish materials for a judgment rather than to force a conclusion of our own.

A policy of isolation is so generally allowed to be suicidal to the party adopting it, that proof of its necessity may fairly be demanded from those who recommend it. Here is the Commission. It is already at work, under instructions which have been briefly sketched. How shall we deal with it? What are the grounds of opposition? Why should we separate ourselves from our countrymen, and withstand an effort for the common good? Why must we court an increase of odium, suspicion, and ill-will? If any principle of our religion demands it, the sacrifice must be made. Any how it will be made with regret, because the interests primarily compromised are those of multitudes of the young and poor rather than our own. But when religion requires sacrifice, it must be made at all risks, and the consequences left to the disposal of Almighty God. Is any religious principle at stake here? We have seen no attempt to state it, if there be; and meantime, until better instructed, we altogether disbelieve that any Catholic principle forbids coöperation with the Commission. Had such principle existed, surely we should not have heard of authorised applications for the appointment of a Catholic commissioner.

The reasons given for dissent and hostility, avoiding reference to principle, allege the following grievances: (1) there is no Catholic on the Commission; (2) the Assistant Commissioners are Protestants; (3) the Government is bound by agreement that only Inspectors appointed with the approval of the *Poor-School Committee* shall report on Catholic schools; and (4) the inquiries of the Assistant Commissioners extend to religion. Such are the alleged grounds of resistance to the Commission. Will they bear examination?

1. There is no Catholic Commissioner. The Royal Commission includes seven persons; six of them belong to the Established Church, and one is an Independent. Why have Catholics a right to claim a nomination, and to consider themselves wronged by neglect of their claims? It must be either that some among us possess a peculiar and undeniable fitness for the post, or that our general efforts for education

bring us into particular prominence. Personal remarks are highly distasteful, but sometimes unavoidable. It has been said above that, in our opinion, Mr. Hutchison would have made an excellent commissioner. He has been among Catholics pretty nearly what Mr. Rogers is in the Establishment; and his wisdom and experience upon all social questions might have been turned to valuable account. He, however, was not so much as named among Catholics. The gentleman put forward occupies, indeed, a leading position in our community; and if the call had been for a Catholic layman of exemplary piety, possessing the fullest confidence of Catholic Bishops, and committed to the strongest views upon the utter worthlessness and dangerous tendencies of all education apart from the Catholic religion, there is one man who must unite the suffrages of all. But Mr. Langdale himself would consider it an insult to be told that he must now dismiss preconceived opinion, and begin a fresh investigation into subjects on which his sentiments have a thousand times been given to the public. He would not deem himself a suitable person for discussing questions of Protestant education, and helping to decide them; and he would be least of all surprised if a Commission on Education comprising the well-known name of the chairman of the *Catholic Poor-School Committee* excited the hostility of all other denominations throughout the kingdom. Had Lord Shaftesbury been selected, certainly no sane man would have wondered at the reclamations of Catholics.

Since, then, no application for the appointment of a Catholic was pressed until after the Commission had been gazetted; since, when that event had taken place, the modest proposal that her majesty should cancel the Commission, and issue a new one to include a Catholic commissioner, was accompanied by mention of a name* which, however illustrious in the Catholic point of view, was unsuitable for the general purposes of the Commission; it cannot be maintained on personal grounds that wrong has been done by the omission of Catholics. But perhaps, although Catholics either have no fit man, or did not put him forward, yet our general efforts for education have been so prominent that it was incumbent upon Government to appoint one of our body in recognition of the services of the rest, and as an encouragement to further exertion. Comparative views are not always easy. What is near us seems large. We know all that we do ourselves, and little of what is done by our neighbours. Thus, while it is quite natural that Catholics should magnify the efforts they

* Canon O'Neal's letter in the *Register* is our authority for introducing this name.

have made, it is equally inevitable that the Government, which not only has no Catholic members, but cultivates no connection with Catholics, should unduly depreciate what we have done. Happily public documents exist, prepared without view to the present question, to which both parties may fairly appeal. What evidence, then, is afforded by the Educational Census of 1851 regarding the position occupied by Catholics in comparison with other religious denominations? We are afraid we must ask the attention of our readers for some dry figures. In 1851 there were in England and Wales 12,708 public schools for the poor, supported by religious bodies, with an attendance of 1,188,786 children. The denominational table gives the following results:

	Schools.	Scholars.
Supported by Established Church	. 10,555	. . 929,474
British School Society 514	. . 82,597
Independents 453	. . 50,186
Wesleyans 381	. . 41,144
Jews 12	. . 2,361
Various Dissenters of 22 denominations	968	. . 41,642
Catholics	339	. . 41,382

From the above authentic data the work of Catholics in 1851 becomes plain. In that year they maintained rather more than 27 in every 1000 of the schools, and rather less than 35 in every 1000 of the scholars, in public schools supported by religious bodies. About three per cent of public-school work may be said to have been carried on by Catholics. Since 1851 rapid increase has been effected; but the immense sums paid annually out of the parliamentary grant towards the erection of new Protestant schools show that others have been advancing as rapidly as ourselves, and it seems improbable that any great change has been made in our relative position. Besides the day-schools enumerated above, there are about 15,000 private schools for children of the labouring classes, attended by 225,000 children, which are not classified denominationally, and of which very few can be accepted as satisfactorily Catholic. From what has been said, it appears that, as we are far indeed from supporting one-seventh of the schools or scholars, so we have small right to demand one member in a commission of seven. If we are not represented, neither are the British Schools, nor the Wesleyans, nor the Presbyterians, nor the Jews, nor any of the various dissenting denominations, excepting the Independents. If we are wronged, so are they. If we have a right to one commissioner, they have the same. Then, when one Catholic and twenty-five Dissenters have been added to the roll, the Church

of England will urge with irresistible force, that as 83 per cent of the schools and 78 per cent of the scholars are maintained by its influence, it must have at least 100 commissioners to face 26 opponents! To argue so is to destroy the Commission entirely, and to rule that the State is incapable of inquiring into and improving the condition of popular education.

But further: supposing the present Commission cancelled, one of its members dismissed, and a Catholic substituted, should we gain any thing by the change? It would assuredly have been gratifying to any individual amongst us to receive the mark of confidence implied in the original selection; and the Catholic body would have been pleased and astonished, just as it would be astonished and pleased by the appointment of a Catholic judge. But now even this cold gratification will be wanting. Our Catholic member, foisted on unwilling colleagues, would maintain a perpetual irritation; and, unable to carry any of his views, would practically, by his obnoxious presence, deprive them of the fair consideration which otherwise they would be likely to obtain. It cannot be pretended that the assistance of a Catholic is necessary to inform the Commission upon Catholic subjects. The Commission will willingly visit all Catholic schools, public and private; it invites information from every Catholic competent to give it, whether Bishop, priest, or layman, schoolmaster or schoolmistress, religious or secular. All that we are willing to tell or to show, it will know. A commissioner's service would be questionable who should tell more.

At length, however, the inquiry would be closed, discussions over, and the final report drawn up. Would the Catholic commissioner sign it, or not? The object is a national one—the promotion of popular education; and as by common consent religion is mixed with education, and the bulk of the English people are Protestants, the recommendations of the Commission must go to promote Protestantism. Accidentally, if fair, they would certainly promote the interests of the Church; but in a less degree. Would a conscientious Catholic be likely to sign such a report? If he sought appointment on the Commission without hope or intention of arriving at a common conclusion with his colleagues, then his service would surely be disingenuous, and his conduct unbecoming a man of honour. If, however, the Catholic member found himself, after all, able to sign the report, his signature would, in some sense, commit the Catholic body to its recommendations, and would be used in parliament and elsewhere to silence Catholic objections to any of them. The

Committee of Council on Education, under several governments, has consisted invariably of Protestants, and we never heard a charge of partiality brought against it; on the contrary, we have frequently heard priests contrast its plans and operations with those of the Poor-School Committee, to the discredit of the latter body. Availing ourselves of all considerations within the range of our observation, as well as of the experience gained in the case of the Patriotic-Fund Commission, we are disposed to think it matter of congratulation that there is no Catholic upon the Education Commission.

2. But the Assistant Commissioners are all likewise Protestants. We avow our regret that this should be so. It would have been desirable that some Catholics should be employed in this capacity. We believe that Catholics might have secured appointments, had applications been made by men of proper qualifications; and even now, or at a later period, it is quite possible that such appointments may be made. Inoffensive names should be selected; because each Assistant Commissioner has within his district to conduct a general inquiry, and to visit all schools of all denominations. Such duties, delicate under any circumstances, demand extraordinary caution and reserve from a Catholic; since there is no district where Catholics are not largely outnumbered by Protestants. It would be quite unreasonable to expect that a considerable number of Catholics should be appointed. The majority must, of course, be Protestant; and since every district comprises Catholics and Catholic schools, the greater number will inevitably fall under the ken of Protestant commissioners. If the majority must do so, and no reasonable objection can be taken, then the whole may do so without violation of principle. It follows that the religion of the Assistant Commissioners, though matter of regret, affords no valid ground of resistance to the Commission. If any of them, contrary to the express tenor of their instructions, should manifest any religious bias, or misconduct himself while examining a Catholic witness or visiting a Catholic school, it would be easy to remonstrate with the head Commissioners, and failing redress, to terminate relations with the obnoxious individual, or, if necessary, with the whole body. The obvious and easy nature of the remedy probably obviates all risk of the disease.

3. The Government, it is alleged, is bound by agreement that only inspectors appointed with the approval of the *Poor-School Committee* shall report on Catholic schools. True in itself, this argument is false in its application. Between the Catholic body and the Committee of Privy Council on Education the agreement exists as stated; and it has been strictly

observed. But the agreement never extended to other departments of the Government. For example: Inspectors from the Government School of Art have visited Catholic schools with a view to the distribution of prizes; the Factory Inspectors, who report to the Home Office, are in the habit of visiting Catholic schools* attended by "half-timers;" and Catholic Reformatories, from their first institution, have been visited by prison inspectors, who are equally under the Home Secretary. Thus it appears that the agreement is not applicable generally to Government departments, but merely regulates the action of the Privy-Council Committee. It cannot, then, in any sense bind the Royal Commission issued by the Crown to inquire (amongst other things) into the system of this very Committee, and to report upon its failure or success. Again, the Establishment, and the Kirk, and the Free-Kirk, and the Dissenters, coöperate with the Privy-Council Committee under similar agreements, which act well enough in the distribution of grants upon certain conditions, but would render perfectly impracticable any general survey of education by the agency of existing school-inspectors. Denominational divisions must be set aside *pro hac vice*, or no common results can be attained. The inquiry, too, is far more extensive than any which school-inspectors have been charged to pursue. It extends over all schools, uninspected as well as inspected, private as well as public; and investigates the educational circumstances of each district in regard to number of schools, value of instruction, difficulties from religious differences, employment, and poverty. It is as comprehensive as ordinary inspection is restricted. It is an inquisition *sui generis*, instituted now once for all, and not to be repeated, at the earliest, before the beginning of the twentieth century. With reference to this Commission, the Government is bound by no agreement at all.

4. But the inquiries of the Assistant Commissioners will extend to religion. We have already acquainted our readers

* The following anecdote, lately told us by the priest of the place in question, shows what permanent damage may be done by laxity in the discharge of engagements. In a certain town, the masters of mills liberally gave their "half-timers" free leave to attend the Catholic school. Their attendance is every where conditional upon a strict system of registration. When first the Factory Inspector visited the Catholic school, he found the books in bad order, but contented himself with a remonstrance, in the hope that on his next visit the registers would be satisfactory. He came again. The books had been more neglected than before; and—what was worse—the "half-timers" were not in school. It was found, upon inquiry, that they were then employed in cleaning the chapel! Of course their attendance at the Catholic school was no longer sanctioned; and all Catholic "half-timers" in the town from that day to this have been obliged to frequent Protestant schools.

how far this statement is true. The Assistant Commissioners will ask what catechism is taught, and ascertain if it is taught intelligibly. Such are their general instructions, applicable to all schools, Protestant and Catholic alike. They will inquire simply into the facts, and are not authorised to express any opinion. Probably, if exemption were desired for Catholics, it could readily be obtained; and the evidence of authorised ecclesiastics would be allowed to settle the practice of Catholic schools, without further inquiry on the part of the commissioners. It is not conceivable that any disposition exists to censure the use of Catholic catechisms in avowedly Catholic schools, or to report that religion is carried either too far or not far enough. Of all persons living, the commissioners are probably the most fully alive to their incapacity to deal with such questions. Supposing inquiries to be prosecuted in Catholic schools, the priest and teacher would be the sole sources of information; and the report would simply retail their evidence. So much reference to religion the commissioners could not omit, since the religious difficulty is notoriously the chief obstacle to common schools. If no religious formularies are taught, or none intelligibly taught, there is little reason why children of different denominations should not be brought together into one school. This religious inquiry, though attended with inconvenience while it lasts, seems to us to possess the highest value and importance in a Catholic point of view. That the Commission is attended with risk, we do not doubt. It is dangerous, inasmuch as it indicates a wish to change; and we are best pleased that education should continue to be promoted as at present. Where, however, lies the chief danger? Is it not exactly here,—that the present denominational system, so complex and costly, should be superseded by some kind of State-supported mixed schools? There is but one impediment to such a consummation, and that is found in our religious differences. Whenever a majority is prepared to give up the use of formularies, and to accept the daily reading of the Sacred Scriptures as sufficient religious instruction for school-children, in that day peril will hang suspended over the heads of Catholic youth. How important, then, how invaluable is the opportunity now afforded of proving to impartial witnesses, not of our own body, that Catholics, while they maintain so many hundred schools, and instruct so many thousand children, every where teach the Catholic catechism, and every where teach it so as to be understood according to the capacity of the scholars, and with one voice declare that they and their children can have no part in schools from which such instruc-

tion is excluded! Acting thus, we free ourselves from complicity in the changes resulting from inquiry, however disastrous they may be; and we adopt the most likely course to preserve intact the existing denominational system. If, on the other hand, we shrink from displaying the religious instruction of Catholic schools, what will be the consequence? Will nothing be known of the religion of Catholic children, and the views of their parents? Far, indeed, from it. It will be known only too surely that the Ragged Schools of London and Newcastle, the Union and Secular Schools of Manchester, the Corporation Schools of Liverpool, the Factory Schools throughout the manufacturing districts of Lancashire and Yorkshire, and private schools every where,—all Protestant institutions,—contain very large numbers of Catholic children, whose repugnance to mixed education, it will be argued, cannot be great, since any inducement,—food, clothing, work, or even fancy,—is sufficient to overcome it. The natural inference will be drawn; and its corrective we shall keep idle—but not at peace—in our own bosom.

Enough, perhaps, has now been advanced to show that the objections which have been urged against the Commission are not conclusive for its rejection. A further inquiry remains. Is not coöperation with it recommended by cogent positive reasons? We are inclined to think so.

Regard to character and standing in the eye of the nation should rather induce us to court than to shun inquiry. True, the Commission will take cognisance of all schools, whether aided by Government or not; but the fact that Catholic schools have received 100,000*l.* from the National Exchequer, and are besides in the annual receipt of about 30,000*l.*, should make us avoid every appearance of concealment. We should be glad of the opportunity to show that building-grants have been spent in erecting schools and teachers' houses, not on churches or presbyteries. We should rejoice to prove that our certificated teachers actually teach poor children, and efficiently too; and that our pupil-teachers render true and honest service for the stipends they receive. How eminently wise and creditable to throw wide the doors, and let the world learn what Catholic education is in fact: not the hole-and-corner mixture of jugglery, immorality, and sedition, which the ignorant imagine, but well-disciplined, pure, and loyal; calculated beyond doubt to train useful citizens and sound Christians. Catholics know the fact to be so; but their assertions, however often or loudly repeated, will never obtain credence among our Protestant countrymen.

A few paragraphs in the report of the Royal Commission would do more to raise the estimate of Catholic education than any other means likely to become available in the course of the present generation.

Thus charity, too, comes in to recommend a prudent co-operation with the Commission. If the works of such priests as Father Hutchison,—if the character and labours of nuns of different orders throughout the kingdom,—if the conduct and discipline of the training colleges, under religious men and women,—were strictly scrutinised and fairly estimated by the Royal Commissioners, the result could not but be that multitudes of Protestants, now blinded by prejudice, would be moved at least one step nearer to the light, and be roused to seek more complete illumination. If, on the contrary, we rudely refuse to be looked on, we manifestly adopt the method described by Hood, and finding John Bull darkened by prejudiced ignorance, we give him two black eyes to help him to see.

The strongest motive among ordinary mortals is not inoperative here. Self-interest bids us sanction and aid the commissioners' inquiry. We have much to lose, and much to gain. It has already been shown that the result of withholding information would be to bring nearer to us the ruin of Catholic primary education, by the adoption of a national system of mixed schools. Short of this result, our loss might be severe. At present we enjoy a fair share of Government grants, because the leaders in parliament have agreed on the justice of allowing us to do so. But if we alienate public opinion by a sulky refusal to satisfy reasonable inquiries, and by casting as many obstacles as possible in the way of measures having the good of the nation for their object, we shall speedily occupy a changed position. Bigotry, never asleep, will soon take advantage of our false step; and the ministry, urged by partisans, and finding us weak and helpless, can scarcely be expected to maintain for us a position which we ourselves shall have made almost untenable. About a thousand persons—many of them religious women—may be said to be supported by the education grant. Fifty thousand children daily attend aided schools. And the application of the grant takes continually a wider range. Its withdrawal would spread through our parishes a consternation which need not be described, and—we have high authority for saying it—would ruin thousands of souls of the poor. The bright side of the picture is more cheering. All the wrongs from which we suffer may now be exposed with prospect of redress. All the wants, which poverty alone has

prevented us from supplying, may now seek relief. The bigotry of union guardians, the tyranny of cotton lords, the destitution of Irish quarters, the struggles of priests, the difficulties of smaller schools, the inequalities of the examinations,*—all and every thing may be brought into the light of day, and for every ill its proper remedy may be demanded. The apprehension of repeated commissions is illusory. The amusement is too expensive for repetition. The visit once paid, the evidence once given; or, on the other hand, one refusal,—and no more dread of inquisitorial commissioners. The opportunity lies now before us: what shall we do?

A question regarding the inspection of Reformatory Schools has been very unnecessarily mixed up with the Royal Commission, with which it has no concern. With the reformatory question we do not propose to deal, beyond correcting a current error. It has been supposed that until now Catholic Reformatories have been visited by the inspectors of Catholic schools; that the Home Secretary has lately made a change, and substituted a prison inspector, who is a Protestant clergyman, for the Catholic inspectors of schools. The facts are these: Every Reformatory, before it could be opened, was visited by a prison inspector; and it was only upon his favourable report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department that the institution was certified. The visits of a prison inspector have been continued to this time in reference to payment from the Treasury. This payment from the Treasury, originally five shillings, and afterwards seven shillings, per week for every inmate, was at first supplemented by grants from the Privy-Council Committee towards the maintenance of schools of elementary instruction attached to Reformatories. The Privy-Council grants were, as usual, conditional upon reports from the school-inspectors. This method of supporting reformatories by grants from two dis-

* The papers set to candidates for certificates and scholarships, whether Protestant, Dissenting, or Catholic, are absolutely identical; but with the exception that papers on religious subjects are proposed to candidates belonging to the Church of England, but not to Dissenters or Catholics. The names are all classed together; and to compensate to Catholics and Dissenters for their loss upon the religious papers, an allowance of marks is made to them. The allowance, however, is moderate, and it is generally understood to be more difficult for a Catholic or a Dissenter to rise into a good place than for a member of the Establishment to do so. In the scholarship examination especially, where the secular papers are confined to five, it must be difficult to retrieve the loss of good marks upon the two religious papers. We hope the Commission will remove this inequality by establishing a separate class-list in religious subjects, as has been done in the Oxford middle-class examinations. Then the relative positions of all candidates, of whatever religion, could in the secular lists be decided with absolute fairness.

distinct departments of government was found clumsy and unsatisfactory; accordingly it was resolved that the Treasury should raise its allowance to ten shillings per inmate, and that the Privy Council should withdraw its grants. With the grants of the Committee of Council, the visits of the school-inspectors naturally ceased. A prison inspector, appointed with special reference to Reformatories, thus became their only visitor. We offer no comments upon these facts, which will certainly receive attention in the proper quarter. Only the complication would have been less difficult if dealt with in time; and the upshot, if it be that monks and nuns throw up the reformatory work, will exactly meet the wishes of Mr. Spooner and his bigoted party.

POLITICAL THOUGHTS ON THE CHURCH.

THERE is, perhaps, no stronger contrast between the revolutionary times in which we live and the Catholic ages, or even the period of the Reformation, than in this: that the influence which religious motives formerly possessed is now in a great measure exercised by political opinions. As the theory of the balance of power was adopted in Europe as a substitute for the influence of religious ideas, incorporated in the power of the Popes, so now political zeal occupies the place made vacant by the decline of religious fervour, and commands to an almost equal extent the enthusiasm of men. It has risen to power at the expense of religion, and by reason of its decline, and naturally regards the dethroned authority with the jealousy of a usurper. This revolution in the relative position of religious and political ideas was the inevitable consequence of the usurpation by the Protestant State of the functions of the Church, and of the supremacy which, in the modern system of government, it has assumed over her. It follows also that the false principles by which religious truth was assailed have been transferred to the political order, and that here, too, Catholics must be prepared to meet them: whilst the objections made against the Church on doctrinal grounds have lost much of their attractiveness and effect, the enmity she provokes on political grounds is more intense. It is the same old enemy with a new face. No reproach is more common, no argument better suited to the temper of these times, than those which are founded on the supposed

inferiority or incapacity of the Church in political matters. As her dogma, for instance, is assailed from opposite sides,—as she has had to defend the Divine nature of Christ against the Ebionites, and His humanity against Docetism, and was attacked both on the plea of excessive rigorism and excessive laxity (Clement. Alex. *Stromata*, iii. 5),—so in politics she is arraigned on behalf of the political system of every phase of heresy. She was accused of favouring revolutionary principles in the time of Elizabeth and James I., and of absolutist tendencies under James II. and his successors. Since Protestant England has been divided into two great political parties, each of these reproaches has found a permanent voice in one of them. Whilst Tory writers affirm that the Catholic religion is the enemy of all conservatism and stability, the Liberals consider it radically opposed to all true freedom. “What are we to think,” says the *Edinburgh Review* (vol. ciii. p. 586), “of the penetration or the sincerity of a man who professes to study and admire the liberties of England and the character of her people, but who does not see that English freedom has been nurtured from the earliest times by resistance to Papal authority, and established by the blessing of a reformed religion? That is, under Heaven, the basis of all the rights we possess; and the weight we might otherwise be disposed to concede to M. de Montalembert’s opinions on England is materially lessened by the discovery that, after all, he would, if he had the power, place this free country under that spiritual bondage which broods over the empires of Austria or of Spain.” On the other hand, let us hearken to the Protestant eloquence of the *Quarterly Review* (vol. xcii. p. 141): “Tyranny, fraud, base adulation, total insensibility, not only to the worth of human freedom, but to the majesty of law and the sacredness of public and private right; these are the malignant and deadly features which we see stamped upon the conduct of the Roman hierarchy.” Besides which, we have the valuable opinion of Lord Derby, which no Catholic, we should suppose, east of the Shannon has forgotten, that Catholicism is “religiously corrupt, and politically dangerous.” Lord Macaulay tells us, that it exclusively promoted the power of the crown; Ranke, that it favours revolution and regicide. Whilst the Belgian and Sardinian liberals accuse the Church of being the enemy of constitutional freedom, the celebrated Protestant statesman Stahl taunts her with the reproach of being the sole support and pillar of the Belgian constitution. Thus every error pronounces judgment on itself, when it attempts to apply its rules to the standard of truth.

Among Catholics the state of opinion on these questions, whether it be considered the result of unavoidable circumstances, or a sign of ingenious accommodation, or a thing to be deplored, affords at least a glaring refutation of the idea that we are united, for good or for evil, in one common political system. The Church is vindicated by her defenders, according to their individual inclinations, from the opposite faults imputed to her; she is lauded, according to circumstances, for the most contradictory merits; and her authority is invoked in exclusive support of very various systems. O'Connell, Count de Montalembert, Father Ventura, proclaim her liberal, constitutional, not to say democratic, character; whilst such writers as Bonald and Father Taparelli associate her with the cause of absolute government. Others there are, too, who deny that the Church has a political tendency or preference of any kind; who assert that she is altogether independent of, and indifferent to, particular political institutions, and, while insensible to their influence, seeks to exercise no sort of influence over them. Each view may be plausibly defended, and the inexhaustible arsenal of history seems to provide impartially instances in corroboration of each. The last opinion can appeal to the example of the Apostles and the early Christians, for whom, in the heathen empire, the only part was unconditional obedience. This is dwelt upon by the early apologists: "*Oramus etiam pro imperatoribus, pro ministris eorum et potestatibus, pro statu sæculi, pro rerum quiete, pro mora finis.*"* It has the authority, too, of those who thought with St. Augustine that the state had a sinful origin and character: "*Primus fuit terrenæ civitatis conditor fratricida.*"† The Liberals, at the same time, are strong in the authority of many scholastic writers, and of many of the older Jesuit divines—of St. Thomas and Suarez, Bellarmine and Mariana. The absolutists too, countenanced by Bossuet and the Gallican Church, and quoting amply from the Old Testament, can point triumphantly to the majority of Catholic countries in modern times. All these arguments are at the same time serviceable to our adversaries; and those by which one objection is answered help to fortify another.

The frequent recurrence of this sort of argument, which appears to us as treacherous for defence as it is popular as a weapon of attack, shows that no very definite ideas prevail on

* Tertullian, *Apologeticum*, 39; see also 30, 32. "We pray also for the emperors, for the ministers of their government, for the state, for the peace of the world, for the delay of the last day."

† *De Civit. Dei*, xv. 5. "The fraticide was the first founder of the secular state."

the subject; and makes it doubtful whether history, which passes sentence on so many theories, is altogether consistent with any of these. Nevertheless it is obviously an inquiry of the greatest importance, and one on which controversy can never entirely be set at rest: for the relation of the spiritual and the secular power is, like that of speculation and revelation, of religion and nature, one of those problems which remain perpetually open, to receive light from the meditations and experience of all ages; and the complete solution of which is among the objects, and would be the end, of all history.

At a time when the whole system of ecclesiastical government was under discussion, and when the temporal power was beginning to predominate over the Church in France, the greatest theologian of the age made an attempt to apply the principles of secular polity to the Church. According to Gerson (*Opera*, ii. 254), the fundamental forms into which Aristotle divides all government recur in the ecclesiastical system. The royal power is represented in the papacy, the aristocracy by the college of cardinals, whilst the councils form an ecclesiastical democracy (*timocratia*). Analogous to this is the idea that the constitution of the Church served as the model of the Christian states; and that the notion of representation, for instance, was borrowed from it. But it is not by the analogy of her own forms that the Church has influenced those of the State; for in reality there is none subsisting between them; and Gerson's adoption of a theory of Grecian origin proves that he scarcely understood the spirit of that mediæval polity which, in his own country especially, was already in its decay. For not only is the whole system of government, whether we consider its origin, its end, or its means, absolutely and essentially different, but the temporal notion of power is altogether unknown in the Church: "*Ecclēsia subjectos non habet ut servos, sed ut filios.*"* Our Lord Himself drew the distinction: "*Reges gentium dominantur eorum; et qui potestatem habent super eos, benefici vocantur. Vos autem non sic: sed qui major est in vobis, fiat sicut minor; et qui prædecessor est, sicut ministrator*" (*Luc. xxii. 25, 26*). The supreme authority is not the will of the rulers, but the law of the Church, which binds those who are its administrators as strictly as those who have only to obey it. No human laws were ever devised which could so thoroughly succeed in making the arbitrary exercise of power impossible, as that prodigious system of canon-law,

* "The Church reckons her subjects not as her servants, but as her children."

which is the ripe fruit of the experience and the inspiration of 1800 years. Nothing can be more remote from the political notion of monarchy than the authority of the Pope. With even less justice can it be said that there is in the Church an element of aristocracy, the essence of which is the possession of hereditary personal privileges. An aristocracy of merit and of office cannot, in a political sense, legitimately bear the name. By baptism all men are equal before the Church. Yet least of all can any thing be detected corresponding to the democratic principle, by which all authority resides in the mass of individuals, and which gives to each one equal rights. All authority in the Church is delegated, and recognises no such thing as natural rights.

This confusion of the ideas belonging to different orders has been productive of serious and dangerous errors. Whilst heretics have raised the episcopate to a level with the papacy, the priesthood with the episcopate, the laity with the clergy, impugning successively the primacy, the episcopal authority, and the sacramental character of orders, the application of ideas derived from politics to the system of the Church led to the exaggeration of the papal power in the period immediately preceding the Reformation, to the claim of a permanent aristocratic government by the council of Basil, and to the democratic extravagance of the Observants in the fourteenth century.

If in the stress of conflicting opinions we seek repose and shelter in the view that the kingdom of God is not of this world; that the Church, belonging to a different order, has no interest in political forms, tolerates them all and is dangerous to none;—if we try to rescue her from the dangers of political controversy by this method of retreat and evasion, we are compelled to admit her inferiority, in point of temporal influence, to every other religious system. Every other religion impresses its image on the society that professes it, and the government always follows the changes of religion. Pantheism and Polytheism, Judaism and Islamism, Protestantism, and even the various Protestant as well as Mahometan sects, call forth corresponding social and political forms. All power is from God, and is exercised by men in His stead. As men's notions are, therefore, in respect to their position towards God, such must their notion of temporal power and obedience also be. The relation of man to man corresponds with his relations to God,—most of all his relations towards the direct representative of God.

The view we are discussing is one founded on timidity and a desire of peace. But peace is not a good great enough

to be purchased by such sacrifices. We must be prepared to do battle for our religious system in every other sphere as well as in that of doctrine. Theological error affects men's ideas on all other subjects, and we cannot accept in politics the consequences of a system which is hateful to us in its religious aspect. These questions cannot be decided by mere reasoning, but we may obtain some light by inquiring of the experience of history; our only sure guide is the example of the Church herself: "*Insolentissima est insania, non modo disputare contra id quod videmus universam ecclesiam credere, sed etiam contra id quod videmus eam facere. Fides enim ecclesiæ non modo regula est fidei nostræ, sed etiam actiones ipsius actionum nostrarum; consuetudo ipsius consuetudinis quam observare debemus.*"*

The Church which our Lord came to establish had a two-fold mission to fulfil. Her system of doctrine, on the one hand, had to be defined and perpetually maintained. But it was also necessary that it should prove itself more than a mere matter of theory,—that it should pass into practice, and command the will as well as the intellect of men. It was necessary not only to restore the image of God in man, but to establish the divine order in the world. Religion had to transform the public as well as the private life of nations, to effect a system of public right corresponding with private morality, and without which it is imperfect and insecure. It was to exhibit and confirm its victory and to perpetuate its influence by calling into existence, not only works of private virtue, but institutions which are the product of the whole life of nations, and bear an unceasing testimony to their religious sentiments. The world, instead of being external to the Church, was to be adopted by her and imbued with her ideas. The first, the doctrinal or intellectual part of the work, was chiefly performed in the Roman empire, in the midst of the civilisation of antiquity and of that unparalleled intellectual excitement which followed the presence of Christ on earth. There the faith was prepared for the world whilst the world was not yet ready to receive it. The empire in which was concentrated all the learning and speculation of ancient times was, by its intellectual splendour, and in spite, we might even say by reason, of its moral depravity, the fit scene of the intellectual establishment of Christianity. For its moral

* "It is the maddest insolence, not only to dispute against that which we see the universal Church believing, but also against that we see her doing. For not only is the faith of the Church the rule of our faith, but also her actions of ours, and her customs of that which we ought to observe." Morinus, *Comment. de Discipl. in administ. Pœnitentiæ*, Preface.

degradation ensured the most violent antipathy and hostility to the new faith; while the mental cultivation of the age ensured a very thorough and ingenious opposition, and supplied those striking contrasts which were needed for the full discussion and vigorous development of the Christian system. Nowhere else, and at no other period, could such advantages have been found.

But for the other, equally essential, part of her work the Church met with an insurmountable obstacle, which even the official conversion of the empire and all the efforts of the Christian emperors could not remove. This obstacle resided not so much in the resistance of paganism as a religion, as in the pagan character of the state. It was from a certain political sagacity chiefly that the Romans, who tolerated all religions,* consistently opposed that religion which threatened inevitably to revolutionise a state founded on a heathen basis. It appeared from the first a pernicious superstition ("exitiabilem superstitionem," Tacit. Annal. xv. 44), that taught its followers to be bad subjects ("exuere patriam," Tacitus, Hist. v. 5), and to be constantly dissatisfied ("quibus præsentia semper tempora cum enormi libertate displicent," Vopiscus, Vit. Saturn. 7). This hostility continued in spite of the protestations of every apologist, and of the submissiveness and sincere patriotism of the early Christians. They were so far from recognising what their enemies vaguely felt, that the empire could not stand in the presence of the new faith, that it was the common belief amongst them, founded perhaps on the words of St. Paul, 2 Thess. ii. 7,† that the Roman empire would last to the end of the world.‡

The persecution of Julian was caused by the feeling of the danger which menaced the pagan empire from the Christian religion. His hostility was not founded on his attachment to the old religion of Rome, which he did not attempt to save. He endeavoured to replace it by a new system, which was to furnish the state with new vigour to withstand the decay of the old paganism and the invasion of Christianity. He felt that the old religious ideas in which the Roman state had grown up had lost their power, and that Rome could

* "Apud vos quodvis colere jus est præter Deum verum." Tertullian, Apolog. xxiv.

† August. de Civ. Dei, xx. 19. 3.

‡ "Christianus nullius est hostis, nedum imperatoris, quem . . . necesse est ut . . . salvum velit cum toto Romano imperio quousque sæculum stabit; tamdiu enim stabit." Tert. ad Scapulam, 2. "Cum caput illud orbis occiderit et ῥύμη esse cœperit, quod Sibyllæ fore aiunt, quis dubitet venisse jam finem rebus humanis orbique terrarum?" Lactantius, Inst. Div. vii. 25. "Non prius veniet Christus, quam regni Romani defectio fiat." Ambrose ad ep. i. ad Thess.

only be saved by opposing at all hazards the new ideas. He was inspired rather with a political hatred of Christianity than with a religious love of paganism. Consequently Christianity was the only religion he would not tolerate. This was the beginning of the persecution of the Church on principles of liberalism and religious toleration, on the plea of political necessity, by men who felt that the existing forms of the state were incompatible with her progress. It is with the same feeling of patriotic aversion for the Church that Symmachus says (Epist. x. 61): "We demand the restoration of that religion which has so long been beneficial to the state, of that worship which has subdued the universe to our laws, of those sacrifices which repulsed Hannibal from our walls and the Gauls from the Capitol."

Very soon after the time of Constantine it began to appear that the outward conversion of the empire was a boon of doubtful value to religion. "Et postquam ad Christianos principes venerit, potentia quidem et divitiis major sed virtutibus minor facta est," says St. Jerome (in vita Malchi). The zeal with which the emperors applied the secular arm for the promotion of Christianity was felt to be incompatible with its spirit and with its interest as well. "Religion," says Lactantius (Inst. Div. v. 19), "is to be defended by exhorting, not by slaying; not by severity, but by patience; not by crime, but by faith: *nihil enim est tam voluntarium quam religio.*"* "Deus," says St. Hilary of Poitiers (ad Constantium, Opp. i. p. 1221 c), "obsequio non eget necessario, non requirit coactam confessionem."† St. Athanasius and St. John Chrysostom protest in like manner against the intemperate proselytism of the day.‡ For the result which followed the general adoption of Christianity threw an unfavourable light on the motives which had caused it. It became evident that the heathen world was incapable of being regenerated, that the weeds were choking the good seed. The corruption increased in the Church to such a degree, that the Christians, unable to divest themselves of the Roman notion of the *orbis terrarum*, deemed the end of the world at hand. St. Augustine (sermo cv.) rebukes this superstitious fear: "Si non manet civitas quæ nos carnaliter genuit, manet quæ nos spiritualiter genuit. Numquid (Dominus) dormitando ædificium suum perdidit, aut non custodiendo hostes admisit? Quid expavescis quia per-

* "There is nothing so voluntary as religion."

† "God does not want unwilling worship, nor does He require a forced repentance."

‡ Athanas. i. p. 363 B and p. 384 C. *μὴ ἀναγκάζειν, ἀλλὰ πείθειν*,—"not compulsion, but persuasion." Chrysost. ii. p. 540 A, &c.

eunt regna terrena? Ideo tibi cœleste promissum est, ne cum terrenis perires. . . . Transient quæ fecit ipse Deus; quanto citius quod condidit Romulus. . . . Non ergo deficiamus, fratres: finis erit terrenis omnibus regnis."* But even some of the fathers themselves were filled with despair at the spectacle of the universal demoralisation: "Totius mundi una vox Christus est. . . . Horret animus temporum nostrorum ruinas persequi. . . . Romanus orbis ruit, et tamen cervix nostra erecta non flectitur. . . . Nostris peccatis barbari fortes sunt. Nostris vitiis Romanus superatur exercitus. . . . Nec amputamus causas morbi, ut morbus pariter auferatur. . . . Orbis terrarum ruit, in nobis peccata non ruunt."† St. Ambrose announces the end still more confidently: "Verborum cœlestium nulli magis quam nos testes sumus, quos mundi finis invenit. . . . Quia in occasu sæculi sumus, præcedunt quædam ægritudines mundi."‡ Two generations later Salvianus exclaims: "Quid est aliud pæne omnis cœtus Christianorum quam sentina vitiorum?"§ And St. Leo declares, "Quod temporibus nostris auctore diabolo sic vitiata sunt omnia, ut pæne nihil sit quod absque idolatria transigatur."||

When, early in the fifth century, the dismemberment of the Western empire commenced, it was clear that Christianity had not succeeded in reforming the society and the polity of the ancient world. It had arrested for a time the decline of the empire, but after the Arian separation it could not prevent its fall. The Catholics could not dissociate the interests of the Church and those of the Roman state, and looked with patriotic as well as religious horror at the barbarians by whom the work of destruction was done. They could not see that they had come to build up as well as to destroy, and that

* "If the state of which we are the secular children passes away, that of which we are spiritual children passes not. Has God gone to sleep and let the house be destroyed, or let in the enemy through want of watchfulness? Why fearest thou when earthly kingdoms fall? Heaven is promised thee, that thou mightest not fall with them. The works of God Himself shall pass; how much sooner the works of Romulus! Let us not quail, my brethren; all earthly kingdoms must come to an end."

† "The cry of the whole world is 'Christ.' The mind is horrified in reviewing the ruins of our age. The Roman world is falling, and yet our stiff neck is not bent. The barbarians' strength is in our sins; the defeat of the Roman armies in our vices. We will not cut off the occasions of the malady, that the malady may be healed. The world is falling, but in us there is no falling off from sin." St. Jerome, ep. 35, ad Heliodorum; ep. 98, ad Gaudentium.

‡ "None are better witnesses of the words of heaven than we, on whom the end of the world has come. We assist at the world's setting, and diseases precede its dissolution." Expos. Ev. sec. Lucam, x.

§ "What is well-nigh all Christendom but a sink of iniquity?" De Gub. Dei, iii. 9.

|| "In our age the devil has so defiled every thing, that scarcely a thing is done without idolatry."

they supplied a field for the exercise of all that influence which had failed among the Romans. It was very late before they understood that the world had run but half its course; that a new skin had been prepared to contain the new wine; and that the barbarous tribes were to justify their claim to the double inheritance of the faith and of the power of Rome. There were two principal things which fitted them for their vocation. The Romans had been unable to be the instruments of the social action of Christianity on account of their moral depravity. It was precisely for those virtues in which they were most deficient that their barbarous enemies were distinguished. Salvianus expresses this in the following words (*De Gubern. Dei*, vii. 6): "Miramur si terræ . . . nostrorum omnium a Deo barbaris datæ sunt, cum eas quæ Romani polluerant fornicatione, nunc mudent barbari castitate?"* Whilst thus their habits met half-way the morality of the Christian system, their mythology, which was the very crown and summit of all pagan religions, predisposed them in like manner for its adoption, by predicting its own end, and announcing the advent of a system which was to displace its gods. "It was more than a mere worldly impulse," says a famous northern divine, "that urged the northern nations to wander forth, and to seek, like birds of passage, a milder clime." We cannot, however, say more on the predisposition for Christianity of that race to whose hands its progress seems for ever committed, or on the wonderful facility with which the Teutonic invaders accepted it, whether presented to them in the form of Catholicism or of Arianism.† The great marvel in their history, and their chief claim to the dominion of the world, was, that they had preserved so long in the bleak regions in which the growth of civilisation was in every way retarded the virtues together with the ignorance of the barbarous state.

At a time when Arianism was extinct in the empire, it assumed among the Teutonic tribes the character of a national religion, and added a theological incitement to their animosity against the Romans. The Arian tribes, to whom the work of destruction was committed, did it thoroughly. But they soon found that their own preservation depended on their submission to the Church. Those that persisted in their heresy were extirpated. The Lombards and Visigoths saved

* "Do we wonder that God has granted all our lands to the barbarians, when they now purify by their chastity the places which the Romans had polluted with their debauchery?"

† Pope Anastasius writes to Clovis: "Sedes Petri in tanta occasione non potest non lætari, cum plenitudinem gentium intuetur ad eam veloci gradu concurrere." Bouquet, iv. 50.

themselves by a tardy conversion from the fate with which they were threatened so long as their religion estranged them from the Roman population, and cut them off from the civilisation of which the Church was already the only guardian. For centuries the preëminence in the West belonged to that race which alone became Catholic at once, and never swerved from its orthodoxy. It is a sense of the importance of this fidelity which dictated the well-known preamble of the Salic law: "*Gens Francorum inclita, Deo auctore condita, ad Catholicam fidem conversa et immunis ab hæresi,*" &c.*

Then followed the ages which are not unjustly called the dark ages, in which were laid the foundations of all the happiness that has been since enjoyed, and of all the greatness that has been achieved, by men. The good seed, from which a new Christian civilisation sprang, was striking root in the ground. Catholicism appeared as the religion of masses. In those times of simple faith, there was no opportunity to call forth an Athanasius or an Augustine. It was not an age of conspicuous saints; but sanctity was at no time so general. The holy men of the first centuries shine with an intense brilliancy from the midst of the surrounding corruption. Legions of saints—individually for the most part obscure, because of the atmosphere of light around them—throng the five illiterate centuries, from the close of the great dogmatic controversies to the rise of a new theology and the commencement of new contests with Hildebrand, Anselm, and Bernard. All the manifestations of the Catholic spirit in those days bear a character of vastness and popularity. A single idea—the words of one man—electrified hundreds of thousands. In such a state of the world, the Christian ideas were able to become incarnate, so to speak, in durable forms, and succeeded in animating the political institutions as well as the social life of the nations.

The facility with which the Teutonic ideas of government shaped themselves to the mould of the new religion, was the second point in which that race was so peculiarly adapted for the position it has ever since occupied towards Christianity. They ceased to be barbarians only in becoming Christians. Their political system was in its infancy; and was capable of being developed variously, according to the influences it might undergo. There was no hostile civilisation to break down, no traditions to oppose which were bound up with the recollections of the national greatness. The state is so

* "The noble people of the Franks, founded by God, converted to the Catholic faith, and free from heresy."

closely linked with religion, that no nation that has changed its religion has ever survived in its old political form. In Rome it had proved to be impossible to alter the system which for a thousand years had animated every portion of the state; it was incurably pagan. The conversion of the people, and the outward alliance with the Church, could not make up for this inconsistency.

But the Teutonic race received the Catholic ideas wholly and without reserve. There was no region into which they failed to penetrate. The nation was collectively Catholic, as well as individually. The union of the Church with the political system of the Germans was so complete, that when Hungary adopted the religion of Rome, it adopted at the same time, as a natural consequence, the institutions of the empire. The ideas of government, which the barbarians carried with them into every land which they conquered, were always in substance the same. The *Respublica Christiana* of the middle ages, consisting of those states in which the Teutonic element combined with the Catholic system, was governed by nearly the same laws. The mediæval institutions had this also in common, that they grew up every where under the protection and guidance of the Church; and whilst they subsisted in their integrity, her influence in every nation, and that of the Pope over all the nations, attained their utmost height. In proportion as they have since degenerated or disappeared, the political influence of religion has declined. As we have seen that the Church was baffled in the full performance of her mission before Europe was flooded by the great migration, so it may be said that she has never permanently enjoyed her proper position and authority in any country where it did not penetrate. No other political system has yet been devised, which was consistent with the full development and action of Catholic principles, but that which was constructed by the northern barbarians who destroyed the Western empire.

From this it does not seem too much to conclude, that the Catholic religion tends to inspire and transform the public as well as the private life of men; that it is not really master of one without some authority over the other. Consequently, where the state is too powerful by long tradition and custom, or too far gone in corruption, to admit of the influence of religion, it can only prevail by ultimately destroying the political system. This helps us to understand the almost imperceptible progress of Christianity against Mahometanism, and the slowness of its increase in China, where its growth must eventually undermine the whole fabric of

government. On the other hand, we know with what ease comparatively savage tribes—as the natives of California and Paraguay—were converted to a religion which first initiated them in civilisation and government. There are countries in which the natural conditions are yet wanting for the kingdom of grace. There is a fullness of time for every nation—a time at which it first becomes capable of receiving the faith.* It is not harder to believe that certain political conditions are required to make a nation fit for conversion than that a certain degree of intellectual development is indispensable; that the language, for instance, must have reached a point which that of some nations has not attained before it is capable of conveying the truths of Christianity.

We cannot, therefore, admit that political principles are a matter of utter indifference to the Church. To what sort of principles it is that she inclines may be indicated by a single example. The Christian notion of conscience imperatively demands a corresponding measure of personal liberty. The feeling of duty and responsibility to God is the only arbiter of a Christian's actions. With this no human authority can be permitted to interfere. We are bound to extend to the utmost, and to guard from every encroachment, the sphere in which we can act in obedience to the sole voice of conscience, regardless of any other consideration. The Church cannot tolerate any species of government in which this right is not recognised. She is the irreconcilable enemy of the despotism of the state, whatever its name or its forms may be, and through whatever instruments it may be exercised. Where the state allows the largest amount of this autonomy, the subject enjoys the largest measure of freedom, and the Church the greatest legitimate influence. The republics of antiquity were as incapable as the Oriental despotisms of satisfying the Christian notion of freedom, or even of subsisting with it. The Church has succeeded in producing the kind of liberty she exacts for her children only in those states which she has herself created or transformed. Real freedom has been known in no state that did not pass through her mediæval action. The history of the middle ages is the history of the gradual emancipation of man from every species of servitude, in proportion as the influence of religion became more penetrating and more universal. The Church could never abandon that principle of liberty by which she conquered pagan Rome. The history of the last three cen-

* "Vetati sunt a Spiritu sancto loqui verbum Dei in Asia. . . . Tentabant ire in Bithyniam, et non permisit eos spiritus Jesu." Acts xvi. 6, 7.

turies exhibits the gradual revival of declining slavery, which appears under new forms of oppression as the authority of religion has decreased. The efforts of deliverance have been violent and reactionary; the progress of dependence sure and inevitable. The political benefits of the mediæval system have been enjoyed by no nation which is destitute of Teutonic elements. The Slavonic races of the north-east, the Celtic tribes of the north-west, were deprived of them. In the centre of mediæval civilisation, the republic of Venice, proud of its unmixed descent from the Romans, was untouched by the new blood; and that Christian people failed to obtain a Christian government. Where the influence of the ideas which prevailed in those times has not been felt, the consequence has been the utmost development of extreme principles, such as have doomed Asia for so many ages to perpetual stagnation, and America to endless heedless change. It is a plain fact, that that kind of liberty which the Church every where and at all times requires has been attained hitherto only in states of Teutonic origin. We need hardly glance at the importance of this observation in considering the missionary vocation of the English race in the distant regions it has peopled, and among the nations it has conquered; for, in spite of its religious apostasy, no other country has preserved so pure that idea of liberty which gave to religion of old its power in Europe, and is still the foundation of the greatness of England. Other nations, that have preserved more faithfully their allegiance to the Church, have more decidedly broken with these political traditions, without which the action of the Church is fettered.

It is equally clear that, in insisting upon one definite principle in all government, the Church has at no time understood that it could be obtained only by particular political forms. She attends to the substance, not to the form, in politics. At various times she has successively promoted monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy; and at various times she has been betrayed by each. The three fundamental forms of all government are founded on the nature of things. Sovereignty must reside with an individual, or with a minority, or with the majority. But there are seasons and circumstances where one or the other is impossible, where one or the other is necessary; and in a growing nation they cannot always remain in the same relative proportions. Christianity could neither produce nor abolish them. They are all compatible with liberty and religion; and are all liable to diverge into tyranny by the exclusive exaggeration of their principle. It is this exaggeration that has ever been the great danger to

religion and to liberty, and the object of constant resistance, the source of constant suffering, for the Church.

Christianity introduced no new forms of government, but a new spirit, which totally transformed the old ones. The difference between a Christian and a pagan monarchy, or between a Christian and a rationalist democracy, is as great, politically, as that between a monarchy and a republic. The government of Athens more nearly resembled that of Persia than that of any Christian republic, however democratic. If political theorists had attended more to the experience of Christian ages, the Church and the State would have been spared many calamities. Unfortunately it has long been the common practice to recur to the authority of the Greeks and the Jews. The example of both was equally dangerous; for in the Jewish, as in the Gentile world, political and religious obligations were made to coincide; in both, therefore,—in the theocracy of the Jews as in the *πολιτεία* of the Greeks,—the state was absolute. Now it is the great object of the Church, by keeping the two spheres permanently distinct,—by rendering to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's,—to make all absolutism, of whatever kind, impossible.

As no form of government is in itself incompatible with tyranny, either of a person or a principle, nor necessarily inconsistent with liberty, there is no natural hostility or alliance between the Church and any one of them. The same Church which, in the confusion and tumult of the great migrations, restored authority by raising up and anointing kings, held in later times with the aristocracy of the empire, and called into existence the democracies of Italy. In the eighth century she looked to Charlemagne for the re-organisation of society; in the eleventh she relied on the people to carry out the reformation of the clergy. During the first period of the middle ages, when social and political order had to be reconstructed out of ruins, the Church every where addresses herself to the kings, and seeks to strengthen and to sanctify their power. The royal as well as the imperial dignity received from her their authority and splendour. Whatever her disputes on religious grounds with particular sovereigns, such as Lothar, she had in those ages as yet no contests with the encroachments of monarchical power. Later on in the middle ages, on the contrary, when the monarchy had prevailed almost every where, and had strengthened itself beyond the limits of feudal ideas by the help of the Roman law and of the notions of absolute power derived from the ancients, it stood in continual conflict with the Church. From the time

of Gregory VII. all the most distinguished pontiffs were engaged in quarrels with the royal and imperial power, which resulted in the victory of the Church in Germany, and her defeat in France. In this resistance to the exaggeration of monarchy, they naturally endeavoured to set barriers to it by promoting popular institutions, as the Italian democracies and the aristocratic republics of Switzerland, and the capitulations which in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were imposed on almost every prince. Times had greatly changed when a Pope declared his amazement at a nation which bore in silence the tyranny of their king.* In modern times the absolute monarchy in Catholic countries has been, next to the Reformation, the greatest and most formidable enemy of the Church. For here she again lost in great measure her natural influence. In France, Spain, and Germany, by Gallicanism, Josephinism, and the Inquisition, she came to be reduced to a state of dependence, the more fatal and deplorable that the clergy were often instrumental in maintaining it. All these phenomena were simply an adaptation of Catholicism to a political system incompatible with it in its integrity; an artifice to accommodate the Church to the requirements of absolute government, and to furnish absolute princes with a resource which was elsewhere supplied by Protestantism. The consequence has been, that the Church is at this day more free under Protestant than under Catholic governments; in Prussia or England than in France or Piedmont, Naples or Bavaria.

As we have said that the Church commonly allied herself with the political elements which happened to be insufficiently represented, and to temper the predominant principle by encouraging the others, it might seem hardly unfair to conclude that that kind of government in which they are all supposed to be combined,—“*æquatum et temperatum ex tribus optimis rerum publicarum modis*” (Cicero, *Rep.* i. 45),—must be particularly suited to her. Practically—and we are not here pursuing a theory—this is a mere fallacy. If we look at Catholic countries, we find that in Spain and Piedmont the

* Innocent IV. wrote, in 1246, to the Sicilians: “*In omnem terram vestrae sonus tribulationis exivit . . . multis pro miro vehementi ducentibus, quod pressi tam dirae servitutis opprobrio, et personarum ac rerum gravati multiplici detrimento, neglexeritis habere consilium, per quod vobis, sicut gentibus cæteris, aliqua provenirent solatia libertatis . . . super hoc apud sedem apostolicam vos excusante formidine. . . . Cogitate itaque corde vigili, ut a collo vestrae servitutis catena decidat, et universitas vestra in libertatis et quietis gaudio reflorescat: sitque rumor in gentibus, quod sicut regnum vestrum nobilitate multa et mira est ubertate conspicuum, ita divina favente potentia secura sit libertate decorum.*” Raynaldus, *Ann.* ad ann. 1246.

constitution has served only to pillage, oppress, and insult the Church; whilst in Austria, since the empire has been purified in the fiery ordeal of the revolution, she is free, secure, and on the high road of self-improvement. In constitutional Bavaria she has but little protection against the crown, or in Belgium against the mob. The royal power is against her in one place, the popular element in the other. Turning to Protestant countries, we find that in Prussia the Church is comparatively free; whilst the more popular government of Baden has exhibited the most conspicuous instance of oppression which has occurred in our time. The popular government of Sweden, again, has renewed the refusal of religious toleration at the very time when despotic Russia begins to make a show, at least, of conceding it. In the presence of these facts, it would surely be absurd to assume that the Church must look with favour on the feeble and transitory constitutions with which the revolution has covered half the Continent. It does not actually appear that she has derived greater benefits from them than she may be said to have done from the revolution itself, which in France, for instance, in 1848, gave to the Church, at least for a season, that liberty and dignity for which she had struggled in vain during the constitutional period which had preceded.

The political character of our own country bears hardly more resemblance to the liberal governments of the Continent, —which have copied only what is valueless in our institutions, —than to the superstitious despotism of the East, or to the analogous tyranny which in the far West is mocked with the name of freedom. Here, as elsewhere, the progress of the constitution, which it was the work of the Catholic ages to build up, on the principles common to all the nations of the Teutonic stock, was interrupted by the attraction which the growth of absolutism abroad excited, and by the Reformation's transferring the ecclesiastical power to the crown. The Stuarts justified their abuse of power by the same precepts and the same examples by which the Puritans justified their resistance to it. The liberty aimed at by the Levellers was as remote from that which the middle ages had handed down, as the power of the Stuarts from the mediæval monarchy. The Revolution of 1688 destroyed one without favouring the other. Unlike the rebellion against Charles I., that which overthrew his son did not fall into a contrary extreme. It was a restoration in some sort of the principles of government, which had been alternately assailed by absolute monarchy and by a fanatical democracy. But, as it was directed against the abuse of kingly and ecclesiastical autho-

riety, neither the crown nor the established Church recovered their ancient position; and a jealousy of both has ever since subsisted. There can be no question but that the remnants of the old Christian system of polity—the utter disappearance of which keeps the rest of Christendom in a state of continual futile revolution—exist more copiously in this country than in any other. Instead of the revolutions and the religious wars by which, in other Protestant countries, Catholics have obtained toleration, they have obtained it in England by the force of the very principles of the constitution. “I should think myself inconsistent,” says the chief expounder of our political system, “in not applying my ideas of civil liberty to religious.” And speaking of the relaxation of the penal laws, he says: “To the great liberality and enlarged sentiments of those who are the furthest in the world from you in religious tenets, and the furthest from acting with the party which, it is thought, the greater part of the Roman Catholics are disposed to espouse, it is that you owe the whole, or very nearly the whole, of what has been done both here and in Ireland.”* The danger which menaces the continuance of our constitution proceeds simply from the oblivion of those Christian ideas by which it was originally inspired. It should seem that it is the religious as well as the political duty of Catholics to endeavour to avert this peril, and to defend from the attacks of the Radicals and from the contempt of the Tories the only constitution which bears some resemblance to those of Catholic times, and the principles which are almost as completely forgotten in England as they are misunderstood abroad. If three centuries of Protestantism have not entirely obliterated the ancient features of our government; if they have not been so thoroughly barren of political improvement as some of its enemies would have us believe,—there is surely nothing to marvel at, nothing at which we may not rejoice. Protestants may well have, in some respects, the same terrestrial superiority over Catholics that the Gentiles had over the people of God. As, at the fall of paganism, the treasures it had produced and accumulated during two thousand years became the spoils of the victor,—when the day of reckoning shall come for the great modern apostasy, it will surrender all that it has gathered in its diligent application to the things of this world; and those who have remained in the faith, will have into the bargain those products of the Protestant civilisation on which its claims of superiority are founded.

* *Burke's Works*, i. 391, 404.

When, therefore, in the political shipwreck of modern Europe, it is asked which political form or party is favoured by the Church, the only answer we can give is, that she is attached to none; but that, though indifferent to existing forms, she is attached to a spirit which is nearly extinct. Those who, from a fear of exposing her to political animosity, would deny this, forget that the truth is as strong against political as against religious error, and shut their eyes to the only means by which the political regeneration of the modern world is a possibility. For the Catholic religion alone will not suffice to save it, as it was insufficient to save the ancient world, unless the Catholic idea equally manifests itself in the political order. The Church alone, without influence on the state, is powerless as a security for good government. It is absurd to pretend that at the present day France, or Spain, or Naples, are better governed than England, Holland, or Prussia. A country entirely Protestant may have more Catholic elements in its government than one where the population is wholly Catholic. The state which is Catholic *par excellence* is a by-word for misgovernment, because the orthodoxy and piety of its administrators are deemed a substitute for a better system. The demand for a really Catholic system of government falls with the greatest weight of reproach on the Catholic states.

Yet it is important to remember that in the ages of faith the same unity prevailed in political ideas, and that the civil as well as the religious troubles of our time are in great measure due to the Reformation. It is common to advise Catholics to make up their minds to accept the political doctrines of the day; but it would be more to the purpose to recall the ideas of Catholic times. It is not in the results of the political development of the last three centuries that the Church can place her trust; neither in absolute monarchy, nor in the revolutionary liberalism, nor in the inflexible constitutional scheme. She must create anew or revive her former creations, and instil a new life and spirit into those remains of the mediæval system which will bear the mark of the ages when heresy and unbelief, Roman law and heathen philosophy, had not obscured the idea of the Christian state. These remains are to be found, in various stages of decay, in every state,—with the exception, perhaps, of France,—that grew out of the mediæval civilisation. Above all, they will be found in the country which, in the midst of its apostasy, and in spite of so much guilt towards religion, has preserved the Catholic forms in its Church establishment more than any other Protestant nation, and the Catholic

spirit in her political institutions more than any Catholic nation. To renew the memory of the times in which this spirit prevailed in Europe, and to preserve the remains of it; to promote the knowledge of what is lost, and the desire of what is most urgently needed,—is an important service and an important duty, which it behoves us to perform. We are greatly mistaken if these are not reflections which force themselves on every one who carefully observes the political history of the Church in modern Europe.

JOHN JONES, MARTYR.

JOHN or Griffith Jones, alias Robert or Herbert Buckley, who afterwards assumed in religion the name of *Godefridus Mauritius*, was a gentleman of Clenock in Caernarvonshire. Like most Welshmen of his day, he appears to have adhered to the old faith; if he was not an “old priest,” he must have been among the first “seminaries” sent over to England, for we find him in a list of priests committed prisoners to the Marshalsea before June 1582, and still remaining there March 3d, 1583.* He is there called Robert Buckley, and may perhaps be identified with the Robertus Jonus, Sacerdos, who appears in the Catalogue of Bridgewater (1588), and previously in that of Nicholas Sanders in 1572. From this we might suppose him to be an old priest, ordained in Queen Mary’s days, if we had not direct testimony to the contrary in a document we have found, from which it will appear that he went abroad to be ordained priest in the first year of Elizabeth, like William Allen and others, who yet are not exactly to be classed with the “seminary priests.” His name still occurs among the Marshalsea prisoners in the list for 1584; in 1585 it is absent; while in a list made between April and October 1586 we find the name of Buckley among the “priests that have been prisoners, and that are out upon bond.”† He did not long enjoy his liberty; either his bond was not renewed, or he was apprehended anew for a fresh exercise of sacerdotal functions, for we soon find him again prisoner in Wisbeach Castle, where, according to Bishop Challoner, he was confined in 1587. On regaining his liberty, either by escape or

* State-Paper Office, same date.

† Harleian Mss., vol. 360, fol. 10.

banishment, about 1590, he left England, and became a conventual friar at Pontoise;* and afterwards went to Rome, where he lived among the Observantines of the Ara Cœli. After a time he was sent back by his superiors to the English mission; and before leaving Rome he had an audience of Pope Clement VIII., who embraced him and gave him his blessing, adding, "Go, for I believe you are a true religious of St. Francis; and pray to God for me and His holy Church." He must have reached London some time in 1593, and became an inmate of the house which was organised by F. John Gerard the Jesuit and placed under the superintendence of Mrs. Anne Line, who was martyred in 1601 for harbouring priests. There F. Jones remained several months, labouring in London, and then went away from the city to look after another part of the flock. He continued this missionary work till some time in 1596, when, as F. Garnet writes, "after this good religious had laboured hard for about three years in tilling the vineyard of Christ with no small profit, he fell into the hands of the heretics, and was kept in prison about two years, during the latter part of which time he was treated with less rigour, and had a certain amount of liberty: the quantity of good he did was incredible, through the great concourse of Catholics that came to him. This state of things might have lasted some time, but Topcliffe the persecutor put an end to it."

A spy had informed the priest-catcher that Jones, before his capture, had visited Mr. Robert Barnes and Mrs. Jane Wiseman—a Catholic lady, who had two sons Jesuits; and that he had stayed two days with them in their prison, had said Masses for them, and received alms from them. For this Topcliffe had them all three arraigned for high treason in the King's Bench Court at Westminster, July 1598. Mrs. Wiseman refused the trial by jury, because she did not choose to let simple fellows damn themselves in ignorance by giving an unjust verdict against her, and was therefore condemned to the *peine forte et dure*, to wit, to be pressed to death with a heavy door over her and a sharp stone under her, as by statute provided in such cases. Jones refused to plead in like manner, with what results we shall learn better from the document which will be given below than from Father Garnet's letter.

Suffice it to say at present that he was condemned, and on the 12th of July 1598 led out to the gallows at St. Thomas Watering to be executed. Topcliffe and a great crowd were

* Oliver, Collections, p. 561.

expecting him. He mounted the cart, and immediately declared that he was innocent, and had never said a word or imagined a thought against the queen or commonwealth.

On this a gentleman who was there said with great earnestness to Topcliffe that an innocent man was going to be put to death. "Patience a while, sir," said Topcliffe; "you shall soon see what manner of innocent he is." Then, turning to Jones, "Tell me," he said, "if the Pope excommunicated the queen, or tried to turn her out of her kingdom to encourage Papistry, what would you do, and what would you advise others to do?" Jones did not answer the question, but was busied partly in talking to the people, partly in prayer; and so Topcliffe took the occasion to fix the suspicion of treason upon him.

After this the persecutor produced a paper purporting to have been written by Mr. Barnes, and containing certain words alleged to have been spoken by a possessed person during exorcism. Among other things, the energumen had said that it was useless to pray for the queen, and the priest had answered, "Wretch, you do not know what God has determined; even to the last moment of life there is time for repentance." Now though Jones had never seen this paper, the contents of which did not concern him at all, yet Topcliffe found it a useful means of exciting the people against him, as one who should say that the queen was a bad woman and one of the reprobate.

The hangman had forgotten to bring a rope with him, so the martyr was kept a whole hour waiting in the cart under the gallows; his time was occupied in answering various questions, and preaching to the people, amid interruptions of all kinds. At last a horseman was heard galloping towards the place, and the excitement became intense when a voice cried out, "A reprieve, a reprieve!" When the man had galloped up, he was asked by a hundred anxious mouths whether it was so. "Ay, ay," he answered, dangling the halter in the sight of the crowd, "here it is." When the time came to draw away the cart, the hangman whipped the horses; but they were held back by three or four stalwart fellows till the martyr had finished what he was saying. At last the cart was withdrawn, and the martyr rendered his soul to God.

Topcliffe, who this time was tender of Elizabeth's reputation for mercy, did not ask to have the rope cut before the martyr was dead. He caused the quarters to be hung on poles in St. George's Fields, by the way-side on the roads to Newington and Lambeth, and the head to be stuck up over

the pillory in Southwark. So far Father Garnet. Dr. Champney, as quoted by Challoner, adds that his head and quarters were afterwards removed by the Catholics, and that two young gentlemen were imprisoned for the deed. One of his fore-quarters found its way to the Franciscan convent at Pontoise, where he had made his religious profession.

The gaps of this account may be partly filled up by the following document, which we found in a Ms. volume formerly belonging to the English Carthusians of Nieupoort, now, with a few other remains of their valuable collection, in the library of the University of Louvain:

“IN ANNO DOMINI 1599.*

The third of July Master Jones was arraigned at King's Bench bar in Westminster, upon these points only, viz. For going over the seas, the first year of her majesty's reign, and there being made a priest by authority done from the See of Rome, and returning back into England, contrary to a statute in that behalf made. And being urged for trial of this to put himself upon a jury, he absolutely refused, because he would not have [his] blood required at the hands of men ignorant in the law. The points of his judgment he directly confessed; yet kept himself from intermeddling in any manner of treason, directly or indirectly, any way belonging to the present state. Whereupon the lord chief-justice answered that he was not charged with any matter of treason, neither was there any matter of treason to be objected against him more than [that] he was a priest and come into England; neither needed there any, for that he was thereby within the compass of the law by his own confession. Notwithstanding the whole bench pressed him again for to put himself upon the country; which he altogether refused, and referred himself and his cause to God and the bench, for that they made the laws, and therefore did know best the meaning of them. And thereupon the judgment was given by Justice Clynke, with the whole consent of the bench, that he should be drawn, hanged, and quartered, as in a case of high treason; which accordingly was executed the 12th of July following, being Wednesday, by seven of the clock in the morning, that few persons should see him.

His true name is said to be Gryffith Jones; he was known in England by the name of Bucle (Buckley) Harbert, and amongst his own brothers in Italy Godefride Moritius.

Master Jones being drawn to Saint Thomas Watering's on an hurdle, and there set on ground, kneeling down at the feet of the gallows, a little praying, and after standing up, did begin to clear Master Barnes and Mistress Wiseman, saying that he did take there upon his salvation that neither of them both did ever give him one penny in silver: where pausing, as if he would enter into some other matter, he was urged by Topcliffe, who said, ‘But gold they did

* Mistake of 1599 for 1598.

give you;' then he, replying directly, said, 'Nor yet gold.' Then being charged for saying of Mass at his chamber in their presence, he protested that he said no Mass there in their presence. Then Topcliffe (exclaiming) said, 'No, for they were public prayers; for that there was no supellectile.' 'There is no such things, Master Topcliffe; neither did I say any public prayers at all in their hearing.' Then being charged for private prayers, he confessed with thanks to Almighty God for that grace that he said such short and secret prayers as he had ever used after he was newly risen; and so he said he would do as long as he lived, 'do you, Master Topcliffe, what you will.' Then being interrupted by the under-marshal and Topcliffe, [he] kneeled down again to his private devotions, and was enforced to endure most vile slandering, blaspheming, and lying of Topcliffe concerning an exorcism, et cætera. After a quarter of an hour, or thereabouts, he was helped up into the cart by Topcliffe, to speak and answer to divers absurd questions concerning the queen, the state, and the realm; whereunto he directly answered, with protestation, that he never to that hour wished more hurt to the queen, the state, or the realm, than he did at that very instant to his own soul: and further he protested that he was free from all treason, either in act, word, or thought, as he had done before to the lord chief-justice and the rest of the bench at the bar; repeating that the lord chief-justice openly declared, in the presence of an hundred persons at the least, that there was no matter of treason objected against him more than that he was a priest and of the order of St. Francis. And the under-marshal said that it was true; and then he proceeded to his former speech, which was that he daily prayed for the prosperity of her majesty, and so he did then publicly desire with all humility Almighty God to grant her grace, and preserve her both of body and soul, and that she might live and be His faithful servant. Then Topcliffe charging him and all other priests and Catholics of disloyalty towards her majesty, and that they would willingly kill her if they could, he presently answered, that he assuredly believed that both he himself with all other priests and Catholics would be more ready to suffer much more for the good of the queen than Master Topcliffe would; further he told him, with great resolution, that his cruelty only hath been sufficient to make her odious to all the priests in Christendom. Whereat Topcliffe railing most impudently and perseveringly, then he prayed with great zeal in a loud voice, saying, 'Sweet Jesus, have mercy upon my soul,' repeating this invocation only so long and as often as they would suffer him; but the under-marshal saying in derision that he did forget our blessed Lady, then he spake somewhat loud, both in the way of answering and of prayers, saying, 'Blessed Queen of heaven, be my advocate and pray for me now and ever;' and then, praying as before, 'Sweet Jesus,' he with hands lifted up as he might, being bound with cords, desiring all Catholics being present to say one *Credo* and pray for him; then Topcliffe railing again most barbarously and bitterly;—saying, if they would not give him leave to speak, that

they would not interrupt him in his prayers, for that he did come thither to suffer death for his conscience and his priesthood only, according as the judgment was given upon him; recommending his soul to Almighty God with an unchangeable courage and countenance. The cart was taken away; which being done, he suffered death most constantly, hanging until he was altogether dead,—the which was often required of the whole multitude. So was he quartered, and his head set upon a pole over against the pillory in Southwark; which remained there two days, with so cheerful and smiling a countenance as when he lived, so that it was great marvel to all beholders, so that many did come to see it, that the officers did take it off, and scratched his face with the nails of their hands and other instruments, disfiguring it, and so put gunpowder to make it deformed, and set it up then again; but in short time it was taken away and kept as a relic: and fixed his four quarters on four several trees adjoining to the highway; and one of the four quarters did bleed freshly within two days that it was hanged; but all was taken away in short time.

DEO GRATIAS.³⁷

We have no means of determining the authorship of this fragment. Father Garnet promised either himself to write the life of the martyr when he had more time, or to get it written by a Franciscan priest,—“a great servant of God, who goes about working with us; and who, after a very long and perilous journey, was taken by the heretics, but effected his escape in a manner that evinced great coolness and courage, and is now in safety.” But the foregoing piece does not seem to be the fragment of a biography, but a description of a single incident by an eye-witness. Such accounts of martyrdoms used to be sent round in manuscript to the different English convents of the Continent, where they were sometimes copied into one of their books. The present fragment occurs in a book that consists chiefly of sermons, and translations from various spiritual writers,—in fact, just where we should least have expected to find it.

We owe what we know of this Franciscan martyr to the zeal of the Jesuit Father Garnet, and to the piety of some solitary Carthusian who took the pains to copy the fragment we have printed. It is refreshing to find an instance of fraternal feeling reigning among all orders and ranks in the Church. For, as Father Garnet says in the opening of the letter to Acquaviva, of which we have made so much use, “those events which shed a lustre on the religious” (we might say in general the Christian) “life, although divided among different families, are yet in a certain way common to all. And for me, I can have no greater pleasure than to take every

opportunity of serving the members of other orders, and so to keep alive the love which should exist among those devoted to Christ."

TOASTING THE POPE.

SOME remarks that we made in November on drinking the Pope's health have attracted some attention, and raised a discussion which tempts us to resume the subject, in order to contribute some elements to the argument, without any pretence of giving a positive decision for or against the practice.

The opinion advocated by the ablest of our weekly contemporaries is, that if we were beginning afresh, the Pope's health should decidedly be omitted, because the toast is a remnant of barbarism, which will soon be forgotten altogether. But that having introduced it, and, in spite of the indignation of Protestants, having given it precedence over the Queen's health, to withdraw now would be a sign of weakness, a confession that we had occupied an untenable position, a cowardly compromise, which would render us contemptible in our own eyes and in those of our critics. Proper pride and enlightened self-respect, therefore, would alike protest against such a course.

On this we observe, first, that it seems admitted that toasts are at least vulgar, absurd, and barbarous; we will add, that they are stained with the original sin of a pedigree that fathers them upon a debauched and drunken age, whose lineaments they still preserve. Toasts may be no evidence of debauchery and drunkenness now; but the taste that approves them is founded on habits and customs that had their root in such vices. An admiration of the Madonnas of Caravaggio is consistent with the greatest purity and gentleness in the individual: yet it is not less true that art follows the moral type which the spirit of the age approves, that a polyphemic art is the legitimate expression of muscular Christianity; while spiritualised art, which aims at expressing purity, modesty, patience, and tranquillity, is the genuine expression of an age which intellectually and socially approves, if it does not always voluntarily exercise, those virtues. So with toasts; they have on them the impress of an age of rioting and excess. The smell of tavern life exhales from them; and good taste at least feels repugnance to mixing them up with things for which

our enthusiasm ought to be chastened with reverence. We put down religious toasts in the same category of vulgarisms, only redeemed from profanity by their stupidity, in which we place Mr. Spurgeon's startling illustrations of Christian truths or heresies, the comic business at the Exeter-Hall May-meetings, the gross carnal excitement of an American revival, or such tavern-signs as the *In het hemel-ryk*,—"the kingdom-of-heaven tap,"—at Malines, or *The Prodigal's Return* (to wit, from temperance to strong drink) at Battersea.

If this is the case, if we have made a mistake in occupying a position too inconsiderately, consideration will be out of place if it prevents our yielding now for fear of consequences. The reign of religion is one that comes not with noise and shouting and clinking of emptied glasses on loaded tables. It gains ten times more by gracefully acknowledging a mistake than by sticking to it for fear of appearing to give way. Humility does not advance by the way of pride; by yielding in such a case we overcome,—we overcome first ourselves, and then our enemies: by sticking to a fault, we are overcome; we first allow our better feelings to be conquered by our pride, and then we find ourselves weakened by occupying an untenable position, that cannot do us any good, but exposes us to continual attacks.

But in this case the matter is not quite so simple. The "Pope's health," and its position in the series of toasts, is not a thing to be argued only on its own merits, but also on the principles of which the practice has been made the symbol. When Catholics get together as Catholics, the first thing they look for is, a convenient form of expressing their Catholic enthusiasm. When they dine together, they naturally adopt the dinner-forms usual in England, and allow their enthusiasm to express itself in toasts. And until we can provide another form for this expression, to suppress religious toasts is so far to suppress the expression of enthusiasm. But public dinners are got up for the very purpose of expressing this feeling on some point connected with religion; to cut out the toasts is to expunge the part of Hamlet from the play.

Again, though among us there are some quiet souls who would withdraw all that relates to religion from the rough and coarse company of toasts and clap-trap after-dinner oratory, yet in the mass we are not so refined; we cannot subsist without embodying our principles in sensible signs. We must have our meetings, and our means of expressing our feelings. All Catholics, then, except the small minority just referred to, wish to toast the Pope in their convivial *réunions*. But here a divergence manifests itself. Among us

there may be some who forget the spiritual, the eternal, the divine character of the Church, and think of it only as an external organisation, secondary in time and in importance to the social organisation of society and the State. The rest of us may view it as the divinely-appointed organ and expression of religion and truth; and as such, universal, separate in its sphere from any other possible human society, and supreme in interest and importance above all. Each of these views manages to express itself by the place which it assigns to the toast of the Pope.

Now then, are we prepared either to give up all expression of enthusiasm for our religion, or to postpone our religion to our family and country? If not, how can we either omit to toast the Pope; or toast the Queen before him, as Protestants, and perhaps some few Catholics, require us to do? It is evidently impossible, unless we can find another way of expressing our feelings and our principles.

But it would be well worth while to find such another way, both for our own sakes and for the sake of our opponents, with whom our present practice engages us in so many trivial quarrels. Social life is founded on forbearance and mutual respect; not on any accommodation of principles to suit our neighbour's whims or tyranny,—for how can we expect to retain his respect, by throwing our own self-respect to the winds?—but on a certain reserve in the expression of offensive principles, when such expression is not a duty. Now, as it is not a duty for a Catholic to plunge into a religious argument every time he enters an omnibus full of Protestants, so neither, perhaps, is it always the duty of meetings, whose proceedings are sure to receive every publicity through the press, to assume and maintain the attitude of continual hostility to the rest of the society in which our lot is cast. The terms of silence and the terms of expression must be, to a certain extent, a matter of compromise, which moderates the sore evil of harsh, crude, unqualified, unseasonable manifestations; of compromise that respects, not the prejudices of the Pharisee, who pretends to be scandalised at our very existence, and who would not be content with any moderation on our part short of self-immolation, but that respects the invincible ignorance and the traditional suspicions of the mass of our countrymen. Whatever is traditional should always be dealt tenderly with; reason itself runs into the mould of tradition, and forms prejudices which cannot be conquered by the common battery of arguments, but require the patient insinuation and development of new and true principles,—prejudices which must be won, not by the coarse opposition of

rival toasts and convivial rhetoric, but by the magnet of example and stimulants of appeals to conscience.

It may be worth while to analyse the signification of this toast; for though such discussion may not lead us straight to any determination, yet the vacillation of knowledge, and the alternations of a mind that has weighed both sides of an argument, are both wiser and more tolerant than the dogmatism and narrow-minded self-assertion of ignorance. The ignorant man's conclusion may be right, and the conclusion of the student, who in the course of his argument is sometimes swayed to one side, sometimes to another, may be right or wrong. Yet, after all, one is the conclusion of ignorance, the other of knowledge; and the wrong conclusion of the student is much nearer to wisdom than the right conclusion of the ignorant.

When we toast the Pope, we have either a personal or a public and official meaning. If we toast the office of Pope, it is either in a religious or political sense. If we mean the toast to be a political one, our objection to it as a religious toast falls to the ground; but not without still graver objections against it. Toasts, like all other manifestations of opinion, are either objective or subjective—objective, when we intend to express our admiration of a thing, an institution, or a person, quite independently of our connection with it; subjective, when the thing spoken of is only a symbol of our state of mind, a test of our party feeling, a declaration of our own thought. As a subjective *political* toast, "the Pope" is only a badge of party, a challenge to Protestants, an intended insult to their prejudices, a military banner displayed to mock their threats and to show our contempt for their power. As such, it has no more sense than trailing our coat-tails through Donnybrook, and inviting any gentleman to tread on them at his peril.

As an objective political toast, the Pope's health can only mean an admiration of his government in his own states, or an affirmation of his right over other countries, and an aspiration that he may soon have his rights. The first sense is one about which Catholics are not, and need not be, agreed. There are among us those who, like Mr. Maguire, can see nothing but wisdom in the organisation of the government of the Roman states; nothing but prosperity in their development; nothing but peace and safety in their prospects. But all Catholics do not, and, what is more, are not bound as Catholics to take this view. And, in fact, most English Catholics, accustomed to English freedom, do not approve of the continental *régime*, common to Rome with most other continental states. Most

of us are far from thinking the Roman government as good as our own. If we defend the government, it is at the expense of the people; as the friends of Louis Napoleon defend his tyranny by maintaining that all Frenchmen are half tigers, half monkeys, and must be treated as such. So we defend the Italian governments at the expense of the honour and good sense of the Italians; we say it is good enough for them, or as good as they will permit to exist. We declare them to be unfit for self-government, unable to appreciate or preserve freedom. Therefore we can scarcely insist on drinking the Pope's health with this meaning. Neither can we mean the toast as an affirmation of his political rights over other states, or an aspiration that he may speedily recover them. The Pope's political rights over princes were voluntarily ceded to him by the princes themselves, and afterwards retracted. He was by European consent the arbiter of national disputes, and the judge of international quarrels. His rights, which were never very secure or firm, were afterwards completely reversed by the act of the representatives of those who had ceded them. Princes would no longer submit to his decision; so they had to cede to revolution and the block. Despotisms, which refused to be tempered by papal remonstrance, are tempered by assassination: imprisonment, banishment, and the scaffold have taken the place of the penances which Popes used to impose. Princes have renounced his fatherly rod, and have been taken in hand by the people. We do not pronounce any opinion on this change; it is a fact of the age; politically the Pope has no rights out of the Roman state: if we assert he has, we assert what is notoriously false; if we hope he may have, we set up our wishes against the emphatic voice of history. Our only sensible plan is, to accept the situation, and make the best of it. "The Pope," says Dr. Brownson, "as temporal prince, has no more authority over me than the Emperor of Austria." It is a fact; and all proof that he once claimed such authority, that he gave away Ireland, that he deposed and restored John, and offered Philip II. the throne of Elizabeth, is too little to show that the authority either exists or can be claimed now. Besides, do not the majority of our clergy, and all our lawyers and public men, abjure this doctrine solemnly on oath? We have no right to assert it in their presence by toasts, and thus to involve them in the suspicion of insincerity, even if we are weak enough to make ourselves the enthusiastic partisans of a departed doctrine in private assemblies, where none but men of like opinions congregate. As a political manifesto, then, the toast of the Pope's health is senseless, except we mean it as a party

watchword; and then it only ceases to be senseless to become offensive,—offensive, as making what should be the symbol of peace into the shibboleth of war; and offensive, as dragging into party-questions a person who, as the common father of the faithful, should be above all party.

To toast the Pope with an intention purely personal, is not likely to be the practice in this country. But in 1846 and 1847 the Italian and other radicals threw up their caps and shouted *Evviva Pio Nono*; but could never be induced to cry out *Evviva il Santo Padre*; because they hated the office, and loved the individual, and only so long as they thought him the instrument of their views. With us just the reverse holds good. We may, and in the present case we do, esteem and love the man for his virtues; but it is always the Pope whom we reverence and obey. But Protestants, when they hear us first toasting “his Holiness Pope Pius IX.,” and then “her Majesty Queen Victoria,” are naturally misled into the idea that as their loyalty to the Queen is personal, and as they esteem not her only, but her rule and the whole constitution, with her at the head of it, quite otherwise than they esteemed George IV. and the same constitution and government when he administered it, so we expend our ecclesiastical loyalty on Pius IX. and his *entourage* of Cardinals, ready at the same time to criticise and abuse Clement XIV., or Pius VII., or Urban VIII., or the successor of Pius IX.; keeping our affections for certain persons, certain measures, or certain leanings in the papacy, and not for the papacy itself. If this were so,—if we toasted Pius IX. in a way in which we should not have toasted Gregory XVI.,—if we spent our affections on the man Ferretti, or Ganganelli, or Borghese, and not on the successor of St. Peter and Vicar of Christ,—then assuredly we should have no right to toast him before the Queen; for he could, in that case, represent only a line of ecclesiastical policy, or a philosophical or dogmatic bias, whereas the Queen represents to us social life, the safety of families, public justice, civil freedom, and the defence of our country,—more important objects than the ebb and flow of theories and the changing lines of administration, even though they affect the organisation of the Church.

As we cannot, then, mean “the Pope’s health” for a political or a personal toast, it remains that we intend it as a religious toast; as such it is only just tolerable, not because our chief veneration is not due to him, but because the toast is a very objectionable mode of testifying that veneration. But if the Pope’s health is a *bonâ-fide* religious toast, then let us consider what is intended by it. It is drunk as a method of

manifesting and exalting our enthusiasm towards our religion, and the Holy Father who is the head of it. It is an article of our creed translated into the language of our cups. So far as it is a mere confession of faith, it is superfluous; because as a religious toast it can only be drunk in exclusively Catholic assemblies, where the fact of being present is quite as good a general profession of the same dogma. So far as it is an instrument of exalting our feelings and drawing out our enthusiasm for our faith, let us consider whether the peculiar kind of enthusiasm brought out is not rather fitted for muscular religion than for Christianity; whether it is not rather the flushed face, the quickened pulse, and excited brain of the dancing dervish, or the bacchanalian, than the sober resolution of the Catholic. But again, the place that the Pope's health occupies in the series of toasts has a religious significance; it testifies to our belief that the *pontificale* is over the *regale*, and serves as a protest against all lax Catholics who disbelieve that truth. It may be so; but then it may be questioned whether it would not be better to wash our dirty linen *en famille*, and to avoid discussing our own differences in a way that is sure to gain the attention and to invite the partisanship of those without. To drink the Pope's health first is our way of attaining the politico-religious object of putting lax Catholics to shame. Surely we could find some other way of paying this delicate compliment to our own brethren (who, mistaken as they are, are still within the pale of the Church), without bringing down on ourselves the whole body of the Protestants of England, who mistake our intention, and take that for a political manifesto, directed against themselves, which we, it appears, only mean for a religious protest against some of our fellow-Catholics.

Still it remains that, in spite of all drawbacks, we ought on all public occasions to make profession of our loyalty to the Holy Father, and to testify our enthusiasm towards him in a way at least as remarkable as that in which we testify our loyalty to the Queen, our veneration for the lord-mayor, or our enthusiasm for the hounds. And how is this to be done but by toasting him? Certainly the answer is difficult. It might be said, Why not divide the sphere of religion from that of politics and life, and refuse to use the same modes of manifestation for the two? And it might be replied, That we cannot live two distinct lives in this world; our nature cannot be divided against itself; the same feelings of love, reverence, and gratitude, which move us in our earthly relations must move us also in our heavenly relations. And the same feelings in both their uses must be ministered to by

the same organs: we have not different knees to kneel to the Queen and to kneel to God; we have not different tongues to shout for Prince Albert and for the Pope; we must be content to make the same outward manifestations in both cases, leaving the intention to determine their fundamental difference.

Nevertheless, as toasts are now considered a remnant of barbarism, and are likely soon to be relinquished in well-conditioned public meetings, as they are already in private society, might it not be better to loosen the cords that unite them with our religious feelings, and find some other way of expressing them? We own that it is hard to find a substitute for them. We suggested that the Pope might come in with the grace: as we thank God for a good dinner, we might as well thank Him also for having made us Catholics; as we pray for the souls of the departed, we might as well pray for the spread of our religion and the success of the Holy Father's wishes. The chairman, too, might make it a rule to say, that as religion comes before politics, the Pope must come before the Queen, if his health is drunk at all; but that as it would be indecent to propose as a toast "the Catholic Church and the See of St. Peter," or "the Vicar of Christ," so the name "Pope," which is only another word for the same thing, does not agree very well with wine and spouting, and is more honoured by being simply mentioned with reverence than by being roared out, even with all the honours. But if we do still retain the toast, we might try the effect of changing the mode of giving it. The word "Pope" has come to be disgusting to Protestant Englishmen; they attach to it a mixed idea, partly pretender to the crown, partly revolutionary agitator, and the rest crafty upholder, for political purposes, of a superstition he does not believe. Hence, when we toast the Pope, we are traitors; when we toast him before the Queen, we are regicides and cannibals. "Pope" means in England what "political parson" means in America. "Holy Father," "Vicar of Christ," "Successor of St. Peter," are terms that are not yet spoiled; if we toasted them, people would see more clearly that we only intended to profess our faith, and not to insult the English constitution. The only question is for ourselves, whether these terms are not as yet too religious in sound to be profaned by union with a toast.

As to the question, whether to retire altogether, and to give up the toast without any substitute,—it might seem an inglorious compromise; but then, it is to be remembered that compromises, even in religion, are of continual occurrence.

Every concordat is a compromise; the excommunication of every one that attempts to convert a Mahometan in Syria is a compromise; every concealment, every reticence of Catholics under stress of penal laws, is a compromise; the withdrawal of the Litany of Loretto from our public worship, and the making our chapels look as much like Protestant places of worship as possible, was a compromise now happily no longer needed. The Church is continually making compromises with regard to the externals of religion, when less harm results from the breach than from the observance of certain positive laws. The compromise of leaving out the toast would be nothing as important as this: we should relinquish no principle, weaken no conviction; we should simply give up an irrational practice, that we adopted without consideration, to express a truth that might be as well expressed in another way. Still, until another way of expressing it is invented and adopted, we are far from deciding dogmatically that the toast should be given up.

Literary Notices.

The Art of Extempore Speaking: Hints for the Pulpit, the Senate, and the Bar. By M. Bautain, Vicar-General, and Professor at the Sorbonne. Translated from the French. (London, Bosworth and Harrison.) M. Bautain's little book of directions and rules for cultivating the faculty of extempore speech is decidedly a good one, though we cannot say much for the elegance of the translation. If needed for Protestants, as we suppose it is, from their publishing this translation,—though extempore preaching is of the rarest occurrence among them,—how much more is instruction in this most difficult art necessary among us, where almost all clergymen are expected to have some mastery over it! Yet, if we will trust the long experience of an able observer and teacher, the natural aptitudes required for it are so peculiar, and in their combination so rare, that it seems ridiculous to expect that even any large percentage, much less every individual, of any given class should possess them. Knowledge may be acquired, and the charity which wishes to impart this knowledge; the laws of thinking may be learned; grammar and rhetoric are more or less within the powers of any one who will really study them and practise them. But what shall we say to those natural dispositions which M. Bautain declares are absolutely necessary for the extempore orator?—A lively sensibility, that is vividly excited by ideas, feelings, or images, but continues always under the government of the reason and will, and never attains the vehemence which paralyses the expression through the fullness of feeling, and by producing a kind of intellectual apathy;—a keen intelligence, that reads clearly all that is passing in our minds, and accounts for it, and embodies it in conceptions,—that knits well the thoughts into the

proper order, and sees double like Janus, within to the plan of the thought, and without to its expression ;—right reason or good sense,—an element which clever persons may lack, and which those who wish to appear clever generally do lack ; for the spasmodic endeavour to look at things from an original point of view obstructs the power of looking at them in a right light, in their true meanings and natural bearings ;—readiness of imagination, that clothes our abstrusest thoughts in raiment, and renders them visible ; that paints before our eyes the plan we have to follow ; that enables us suddenly to represent to ourselves what we wish to express to others when a new thought arises, or an image germinates like a flower in the heat of speaking. It requires quickness and clearness ; to have to go over your ground again, or to grope for your words while speaking, is, says M. Bautain, as bad as braying like a donkey. Then there must be firmness and decision of will ; courage to face the thousand upturned critical eyes, the ominous silence : not simply courage, but even rashness is wanted. Then there must be an expansiveness of character ; there must be a thirst for expounding, a feeling of the necessity of communicating to others what you have received : and this must not be allowed to grow into an impertinent levity of mind, or a boring didactic sense of duty, or a venturesome superficial facility of pouring out thought. Lastly, the list of natural requirements is closed with an instinctive or natural gift of speaking. “ There are men,” says the abbé, “ organised to speak well, as there are birds organised to sing well ;” without this gift of nature it is vain to attempt to be an orator.

And all these qualities must not only be in the mind, but they must be trained to flash out their electrical sparks on the instant. While you are in the rush of speaking, a doubtful phrase coming into the mouth is to be discarded,—an ambitious pretentious expression to be avoided,—a trite truism to be excluded,—a sentence boldly opened to be finished you cannot guess how ; while you are finishing one period, your thoughts must be trained to have got the next all ready for you to utter. Here is enough to make you giddy to think of,—to despair of doing it even with time for reflection ; and all this is to be done on the instant, with certainty and decision, and spontaneously, without too much apparent labour.

Persons who have not these gifts, M. Bautain advises to avoid extempore discourses, and to speak at least from notes ; perhaps to write what they have to say and learn it off, as Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon did ; or even to read from their manuscripts.

The second part has more to do with the speech and its preparation and utterance,—its divisions, plan, conception, arrangement, character ; the intellectual, moral, and bodily preliminaries to speaking ; the mode of bringing forward the different members of the discourse, and the economy of effect. “ Speaking,” says the abbé, with great simplicity, “ is a kind of child-bearing in public, of which the speaker feels all the effort and all the pain ; and in which he is assisted and supported by the sympathy of his hearers, who witness with lively interest this labour of mental life, and who receive with pleasure this bantling of thought.”

Le Christ et les Antéchrists, dans les Ecritures, l'Histoire et la Conscience. Par V. Dechamps, C.SS.R. (Paris and Tournai, Casterman.) What an admirable title for a book ! is a remark that every one who has seen the announcement of F. Dechamps' last work must have made to himself ; and the execution, up to a certain point, is no less admirable. But the range of the work does not quite correspond to the implied promise

of its title; F. Dechamps writes more or less with reference to a coterie. As Mgr. Malou, the Bishop of Bruges (of whose very valuable confutation of Protestantism Mr. Dolman has published a translation executed by Mr. Maclaurin), writes chiefly with an eye to the unscrupulous Protestant propaganda, which, like the English societies for making proselytes of the Catholics in Ireland, is just now in a state of feverish activity in Belgium; so does M. Dechamps, the court confessor, write with an eye to the freethinkers and liberalised philosophers with whom he converses in the court circles; here, as in his former work, *Le libre Examen*, he continually revolves round one truth, that the Catholic demonstration of Christianity is not historical, not argumentative, not a question of this or that doctrine, but an intuition of the Church, the one Church, as now dominating over all other religions. He quotes many passages of St. Augustine, who over and over again says, that as the apostles saw the Head (Christ), and believed the body (the Church), so we see the body, and believe the Head.

The text which (in the Appendix at least) makes most frequent appearance is another of the same father: "I would not believe the Gospel unless the Church determined me to do so." The Church is "the perpetual miracle;" she constitutes that *state of religion* which, as Pascal says, ought to be always capable of affording proof of its truth; hers is that "Catholic unity," of which, as Möhler says, our Lord spoke to His Father as the permanent proof of His mission. This, in the opinion of F. Dechamps, is the grand proof that should be inculcated in the theological course, instead of the abstract technical *à-priori* views drawn from the necessity of nature, the probability of the necessity having been provided for, the establishment of Christianity, its adaptation to our nature, and the like, where abstraction is made of all reference to the corporate notion of our religion, to the Church as a great object, a city set on a hill, and commanding the plains.

We have been asked whether the book appears to us to be in any special way adapted to the present modes of thought in England, or calculated to exert any influence upon them: we must candidly own that it does not. The Protestant majority of the nation is more amenable to the criticism of Mgr. Malou; while the freethinking portion is too immersed in its materialism, or in the extreme of rationalism, to listen to what it would call, without examining it, a professional defence of a professional religion. It requires a man versed in English modes of thought to write for Englishmen.

Mémoire sur les Analogies des Langues Flamande, Allemande, et Anglaise,—*Memoir on the Analogies of the Flemish, German, and English Languages*. By E. J. Delfortrie, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Louvain: in the *Mémoires couronnées* of the Académie Royale de Belgique, vol. xxix. There was a time when the same language was spoken on our Eastern coasts and among the Dunes of West Flanders; when English missionaries could cross over and preach the Gospel to the yet heathen inhabitants of the Low Countries, without the preliminary study of a foreign tongue. Since then our languages have branched asunder; but both in the vocabularies and in the structure of the tongues a family likeness still exists, witnessing to former unity, and facilitating the acquirement of the cognate language. M. Delfortrie has done much to reduce the divergences to system, by investigating the rules for the changes of the several letters. He also gives two Glossaries, one of ancient Flemish, and another of old English and Anglo-Saxon, illustrated by many quotations from the old literature of the respective nations. These Glossaries are full of materials for interesting thought.

The primitive derivation of words gives a great insight into the moral and intellectual state of the people at the time of that derivation; the words common to several cognate languages show to what extent civilisation had progressed in the common stock of the different peoples before they separated. Comparative study of languages thus enables us to arrive at more certain data concerning the primitive history of our race than any other line of investigation can do. There is a simplicity about the nomenclature of our common ancestors that is very striking. Take, for instance, the English *head*, Flemish *hoofd*, German *haupt*,—we see no trace of the meaning of the word till we recur to the old spelling—old English *heved* or *heafod*; old Flemish *hoved*; old German *hobid* or *houbet*; and we can at once connect it with the verb to *heave*, the *os sublime* of man, which is not cast down to the earth like a beast's, but lifted or *heaved* up to the sky: from the same verb the sky itself is called *heaven* (as from the verb to *lift* it is called the *lift* or *loft* in old English); and a thing that requires energy to lift is called *heavy*.

Again, the word *ordeal*, in Flemish *oordael*, literally ear-dealing, distribution after audience, or judgment, is interesting historically as indicating a higher state of civilisation when the word was coined than when the barbarous water-ordeals or fire-ordeals were brought into use.

Another interesting fact, which throws some light on the original status of woman among our ancestors, is the fact that both man and woman were known by the same name, and only distinguished by their characteristic occupations or instruments,—man and woman in the earliest language of our ancestors is *wap-man* and *wyf-man*; the man who carries weapons and the man who weaves; or *swerd-man* and *spille-man*, *sword-man* and *spindle-man*. It is wonderful how the whole idea of the difference of the sexes, not only in the Teutonic tongues, but also in Greek and Latin, is connected with the two fundamental ideas of war and weaving. *Wer* is Anglo-Saxon and old Flemish for man, *vair* is Gothic, *vir* Latin; *wered-folces* and *wifa* is Anglo-Saxon for men and women. From this word every thing manly, real, excellent, receives its name; *werre*, war, the great employment of the man; *guerre* in French, *guerra* in Italian; *wehr*, bulwark or defence, in German; *werry* old English for worry; *ward* or *guard*; to *ware* or *beware*; to *wear* or endure, whence *weary*; to *wrestle*, in old Flemish *worstelen*. Then to go to another idea; as from *vir* comes *virtus*; so from *wer* comes *weortha*, worth, worthy; and by change of the *v* or *w* into the cognate *f*, all the words like *fore*, *first*, *fürst* (as *verboden* becomes *forbidden*)—in Latin we find the same change in *fortis*, and force; *vis vires* is a similar word, as is also the French *verve*, or nerve. And not only is the syllable *wer* the symbol of moral and physical virtue, but of all intellectual good to boot. Thus, as in Latin we have *veritas* for truth, so in German we have *wahr*, *wahrheit*. As in Latin *verbum*, so in English *word*; and the Teutonic verb substantive *worden*, a part of which we retain in the imperfect 'they *were*,' to signify real true subsistence; analogous to this is the word *werk* or *work*, for labour.

Wer also signified top; thus we have in old Flemish *wervel* or *werveltop*, the top of the head, in German *wirbel*; with this we may compare the Latin *vertex*; and as *vertex* is close to the verb *verto*, I turn, so is *wervel* close to the verb *wervelen*, to *whirl* or turn—either from the roundness or motion of the head on its axis, or because all active motion is an attribute of the *wer*, like *werk*, and *werfen*, to cast or throw.

Through this last verb we may trace a male element even in the especially feminine occupation of weaving: the *warp* is the thrown thread,

from *werfen*; the *woof* is the woven thread, that receives the warp. Woman, as we said before, received her denomination with our ancestors from her trade; as Chaucer says,

“ Deceit, weeping, *spinning*, God hath give
To women kyndelie, while they may live.”

Canterbury Tales, 5983.

Yes, the kindly or natural *differentia* of woman, according to our forefathers, was her weaving or spinning; from *weave* comes *weed*, *web*, or *woven*, *weib*, *wife*; *woven*, *woof*, *womb* (?), *woman*; similarly the widely spread word for woman, *quens* (Goth.), *quen* (Anglo-Saxon), *quean* and *wench* (English), is shown by the analogous French word *quenouille*, a distaff, to be connected with the idea of the female occupation: these words remind us of the Greek *γυνή*, *guné* or *gyne*, a woman, in Sanscrit *yoni*; with this again we compare the Latin *cunæ*, a cradle, which by some of its derivatives is shown to be fundamentally connected with the idea of the female sex, and which in composition changes the *cu* into *qui*, so as to come near the Teutonic *quean* or *quens*, which we before showed to be connected with the idea of spinning. We might trace the ramifications of these words much farther; but the full discussion of them would lead us into an argument hardly suitable to our pages.

The farther we go back in English the nearer it becomes to Flemish; insomuch that passages of Chaucer, and even here and there a phrase of Shakespeare, are more intelligible to the Fleming than to the Englishman. If Hamlet challenges Laertes to “drink up *esil*” (the old English for vinegar), the inhabitants of Ypres still call vinegar *gezil*. If the dead Ophelia is allowed “her virgin crants,” Germans and Flemings still call the garland *krantz* and *krans*; the name *Rosencrantz* in the same play, though pure German, seems to have been English also in Shakespeare’s day. When Spenser says, “he doth won *foreby* a fountain,” it is not “he dwells hard by a fountain,” as our Dictionaries say, but it is the Flemish *voorby*, German *vorbei*, beyond.

Some of Chaucer’s phraseology is now good Flemish but bad English. “Wete ye what?” in Flemish “Weet je wat?”—“Al had ye,” if you had, in Flemish “Al hadt gy”—“Had lever gon eten”—“Then gan he wonder loud to laughen”—“Thus starf Hercules”—“Thou canst not winnen thy cost”—“Al so sicker” (so surely)—“Dronke as a maus”—“He hath don make”—“Til that mine herte sterve,” only want a little alteration in the spelling to be modern Flemish, but want translation to make them modern English.

M. Delfortrie’s memoir was written for a prize, in a few months, and therefore, as might be expected, is neither complete nor free from errors; but it is a valuable contribution to the study of English, and suggests much more than it utters.

New Pictures and Old Panels. By Dr. Doran. (London, Richard Bentley.) As long as Dr. Doran contented himself with pouring forth to an amused public the contents of his multifarious note-books, the public, not able to imagine but that something of what they read was his, took him for a clever fellow; and the poor animal, hearing himself so much admired for the lion-skin that he wore, has at length been induced to roar from his own lungs; and the roar, alas, proves to be only a bray. In this book the author undertakes to show us portraits of Dr. Dodd, Oliver Goldsmith, Mrs. Bellamy, John Wesley, and other worthies of that period, who, instead of developing themselves on his canvas in a lifelike way, step forward one after the other, and, with a kind of ballet-dancer’s anxiety to make themselves comprehensible, tell us

who they are, what are their ruling motives, and what they are going to do, as they would in a school-girl's melodrama. Dr. Doran does not know what reserve and economy of speech mean; he has yet to ponder on the truth that words are meant and are used to hide thought even more than to display it. True art unfolds character through the perpetual instinctive endeavour of the interlocutors to conceal or modify it, by only uttering so much as is convenient. Clownish art brings its persons forward, and makes them say bluntly, "I am moonshine,"—"I am wall." Dr. Doran's art is mere clownery, his shallowness prodigious, and his misrepresentations of sacred things that he does not understand impudent.

Another Word to the Goths. By One of Themselves. (London, Burns and Lambert.) This little pamphlet is scarcely addressed to the Goths, but rather to the author of the exceedingly witty squib against the introduction of Gothic into Ireland, which appeared some thirteen months ago, with the title of *A Word to the Goths*. To have left so smart a blow so long unrevengeed argues an unwonted apathy in that usually sensitive body which it smote,—an apathy that *The Rambler* had not the luck to experience when it said its say against their pet theory. But, late or early, here we have the answer, if such it may be called, when it is no answer at all. The writer complained of what Gothic *had* done; the reply denies that Gothic *need* do any thing of the sort. "You have imprisoned priests in dungeons, built churches where no one can catch the preacher but every one can catch a cold, set grim gurgoyles to grimace at the congregation, and walled up all the accesses of light." And the reply is, "Read Mr. Scott's book, and you will see that Gothic architecture *need* do none of these things." This, we submit, is begging the question. The writer of the *Word to the Goths* complains, justly and whimsically, of the inconveniences he is put to by Gothic architecture as actually developed. He makes no pretences to be an architect: evidently a literary man of rarest ability, he only demands the ordinary conveniences of life,—light, warmth, shelter, economy of stairs and distances in a house: he has been victimised by Gothic architects, has been rebuked by them as unwilling to mortify his fleshly lusts for the sake of religion; so he turns and tears their flimsy arguments to rags, and shows that Gothic has nothing to do with religion, and that, if they come to that argument, Rome is against them. He protests against the exclusive, narrow-minded, and tyrannical dogmatism of the Goths, not against the freedom of every one to use what architecture he thinks proper. The fact that strikes him is, that hitherto no Catholic Gothic architect has arisen who has not spoiled his design, or his plan, or his accessories, by the stiffness of his conventionalism, the dryness of his antiquarianism, or his crazy obstinacy. It was not the writer's business to look whether Gothic could be developed in another direction: he had not to build, but to live in houses when built. None had been built to his taste; and he told the Goths so, in winged words pointed with steel. The reply admits the complaint, promises amendment for the future, and refers us to Mr. Scott. When that gentleman has built his Foreign Office, we shall see whether he can verify his promises. Hitherto facts are with the complainant; the respondent's plea is "not guilty, and won't do it again." Apart from the question of their point in the present case, the respondent's principles are liberal and wise, and perfectly tenable. But the Goths must for some time to come bear the growls and the grumbles of the afflicted ones, whom their previous puritanism has made uncomfortable for the term of their natural lives. An inconvenient house is like a bad book; it keeps doing its

mischief after the architect has repented of his sins and has reformed his principles. *Litera scripta manet*; and walls, unfortunately, stand as they were built.

Christianity in China: a Fragment. By T. W. M. Marshall, Esq. (London, Longmans.) This is only the first chapter of a forthcoming *Contrast* of the action and results of Catholic and Protestant missions to the heathen. In consequence of the recent "opening up" of the vast Chinese empire, we have been favoured by most of the Protestant journals with vividly rose-coloured accounts of what their missionaries are going to do in their new field, with multitudinous enumerations of yet unhatched broods of converts, and with calculations of the mighty effect that their preaching will have, founded chiefly on the very insignificant results it has hitherto produced. "A man is the son of his works," said the Spanish proverb, long before Mr. Carlyle. "The glory of Protestant missions is the offspring of their dishonour and contempt," is the contrary principle on which most of these arguments should be founded. But be that as it may, the discussion is one of the greatest interest; one that has, in fact, deeply interested the British public, and induced them to furnish large sums of money to their much-promising missionaries. It is well, therefore, that a picture like this of Mr. Marshall's can be put before them. It is a statement that appeals to mercantile common sense, to a gentleman's feeling of honour, and to religious understanding in an equal degree. It asks, are those persons worth supporting who at so vast an expense do so little, and that little so badly; who have hitherto behaved in so dastardly and discreditable a way; and whose religion consists chiefly in railing at what they do not comprehend, and in exhibiting the amenities of connubial bliss? On the contrary, have not the Catholics succeeded in China, where there are yet upwards of a million native professors of our religion,—where each year has witnessed persecutions and martyrdoms borne with the fortitude of primitive Christians,—and where the annual successes of our missionaries are so great? Mr. Marshall's *Fragment* begins with a sketch of the Chinese missions down to 1773; then comes a most amusing history of the Protestant missions, in a series of biographies of the chief missionaries, from Dr. Morrison, "the first herald of the Gospel" in China, to Mr. Gutzlaff; with an account of their doings, exclusively from Protestant sources. The author then returns to the recent Catholic efforts; and concludes with the recent Protestant attempts, and some judicious remarks on the future prospects of both sides. The subject is one of prime interest and importance; and, to judge by this first chapter, the whole work will exhibit a fullness of research which will render it the best extant on the subject. On this account we lament certain blemishes in the construction of the work: first, it reads more like the work of a reviewer than that of an historian; secondly, it seems thrown together with great haste; and we cannot understand on what principle the text and the notes are divided,—why of two facts, both equally bearing on the question in hand, one should appear in large print, and the other come in as a humble satellite in small,—save that the facts in the notes were discovered after the text had been written, and that the author had not time to incorporate them. This objection is of more importance than it looks. Notes are very well so long as they only refer to authorities; when they are perpetually adding to or modifying the text, they become exceedingly tiresome. If you write a classical book, let some one else half a century hence edit and annotate you and welcome; but as we cannot fancy Thucydides writing notes to his own history, or Aristotle an interlinear gloss to his own philosophy, so we

dislike a man who must be his own commentator. But this is not the ground of our objection to Mr. Marshall, whose failings seem due to want of time. Next,—though we must own that the occasion was irresistible,—we are afraid that his book will lose much of the weight it ought to have with judicious Protestants by the comical way in which he shows up the famous Protestant missionaries: people don't read with pleasure a satire on themselves, or on the heroes of their party. Again, we think that Mr. Marshall might fairly be asked to discuss the weight and trustworthiness of his authorities. He quotes a world of miscellaneous Protestant testimony to the utter inanity of Protestant missions in China, which, with judicial people, will not be accepted till they know not only who and what the witnesses are, but what they said to modify or to contradict the statements quoted. Lastly, we hope that in the complete work the results will be collected into a more statistical form than they assume in the pages of this first chapter.

We conclude with a few miscellaneous gatherings that have struck us. "All the neophytes were obliged by Father Ricci to make a public declaration of their faith *composed by themselves*, as a condition of their admission into the Church; a rule which effectually secured an adequate knowledge of the principles and dogmas of the Christian faith," and one which would seem admirably adapted for other missionary countries also, where scandals sometimes occur from the defective instruction of converts too hurriedly received. Again, in the midst of a vigorous picture of the ruin occasioned by the suppression of the Jesuits, the author says, "But the immutable justice of God has restored them to their place." We wish it were so. They are excluded from Peking, which is of all others "their place;" and the impediment comes from a quarter where Catholics would least expect to find such a hindrance. Again, we all know that the Chinese name for us English is "Western Devils:" we are told by a Protestant authority,—H. C. Sirr, M.A.,—that such is "the impression produced on the minds of the Chinese heathens by the lives of the missionaries being at variance with their preaching, that the common expressions made use of with reference to them are *lie-preaching devils*." In conclusion, we heartily recommend Mr. Marshall's *Fragment* to our readers.

Weeds and Wild-Flowers. By Lady Wilkinson. (London, John Van Voorst.) Sermons in stones—lectures in limpets! Will there never be an end to this scientific twaddle? Can't we poke our noses into a sea-side pool without a moral reflection, or dislodge an *actinia* without finding a text in its stomach? If we want to gather a sprig of forget-me-not or a daffydowndilly for our buttonhole, must we perforce be plunged into a bottomless bog of—your pardon, dear ladies—feminine theology? As we take up this volume, we think, "What a nice gift-book for Christmas!" but we glance at the letter-press, and discover nothing but the old wearisome stupid story. Lady Wilkinson is mistress of a little power of observation, a large power of making extracts, and a forty-horse steam-engine power of sermonising. The poets who make the flowers of the field an excuse for not going to church are bad enough in all conscience; but botanical ladies who make every green field a tabernacle, every gate-post a pulpit, and every buttercup an occasion for an outpour of vapid sectarian drivel, are ten times worse. What business has my lady to take pot-shots at popery from under the shelter of *Diandria monogynia*? It is true her weapon is but a pop-gun, and her pellets but paper; nevertheless her intention is murderous, and if we only scratch as the missile tickles our faces, it is no fault of

hers, she means in very earnest to make dog's-meat of us. But let her ladyship speak for herself.

"ST. JOHN'S-WORT (OR GRASS) SUTSAN, TOUCH (OR TOUCHING) LEAVES, PARK-LEAVES, GRACE OF GOD.

Fuga dæmonum, Hypericum.

Welsh, Erinllys or Eurinlys, Fendigedi, Nele, Ysgol Grist, Yagol Fair, Creulys bendiged, Dail y trwch, Llys perfigedd; *French*, Millepertuis; *German*, Johanniskraut; *Dutch*, St. Jans kruid; *Italian*, Pilatro; *Spanish*, Corazoncillo; *Portuguese*, Melfurada; *Russian*, Sweroboi. *Linnæan*, *Polydelphia*, *Polyandria*. Natural, *Hypericæ*, *Hypericum*."

Well, to our uninstructed minds this torrent of synonyms expresses cramp, colic, dislocated ribs, comminuted fractures, and toothache. Not at all. Hear the preacheress. "Painful are the thoughts, manifold the associations, induced by a consideration of this string of names:—names which bear us backward on the stream of time to those days of old, when the human mind, groping in a moral darkness, was yet unable to attain to the truth, and substituted superstition for *faith*. Still there are some who regret that those 'good old times' are passed, and would fain disbelieve the great advancement made by man in virtue and moral worth, as well as in wisdom and knowledge. But the high standard of public opinion at the present day, and the happy union of religious feeling with good sense, sufficiently disprove that superiority which has been attributed (by a partial and *borné* view) to those times when men were misled by idle traditions and foolish legends, and put more trust in human dogmas and authorities than in the pure and simple precepts of religion. It was then that the legitimate objects of faith were hidden from the view; the lamp of religion burnt low, or her candle was, by heartless ceremonies, 'set under a bushel;' and the intellect was darkened by barbarous fancies and credulity."

Those who like such trash, will find plenty of it; but we hope there are many who do not, and who will lament with us that Mr. Van Voorst has mounted Lady Wilkinson's rushlight on a stick at once so elegant and so inappropriate. We wish the twelve coloured engravings and twenty-six wood-cuts were in better company. The first, we are told in a foot-note, are from Mrs. Berrington, "of Woodland Castle," and we congratulate that lady on a delicate and graceful pencil. The second are also good and characteristic. They are from the *Dictionnaire élémentaire de Botanique* of M. Emile Le Maont. As a contribution to popular botanical science the book has little value.

The Master-BUILDER'S Plan, or the Principles of Organic Architecture. By George Ogilvie, M.D. (London, Longmans.) We have here another book addressed rather to the general than the scientific reader; but very different in character from the one we have just deemed it necessary to notice with some severity. The author has brought forward the homologies of animals as deduced from the works of the great comparative anatomists and physiologists with sufficient technicality to ensure accuracy, but without pedantry or stiffness. His object is to draw attention to the existence of a certain uniformity of organisation observable in each primary division of the animal kingdom, and his conclusion is that God's "orderly method of operating in nature, His manifestation of *physical equity*, as we may call it, shadows out His attributes of *moral equity*; that is, holiness and justice." In this he has the authority of the apostle: "The invisible things of Him, from